

RBL

15 min

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

JANUARY 1956

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

Contributors Include

JAN 1956

PASTORAL WORK

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., PH.D., F.R.HIST.S.

J. ALEXANDER FINDLAY, M.A., D.D.

H. J. S. GUNTRIP, M.A., B.D., PH.D.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS, M.A.

AUBREY R. VINE, M.A., B.SC., D.D.

JOHN T. WILKINSON, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.

JOHN BROWN

H. G. BUDGE

M. L. V. HUGHES, B.A.

EDWARD LANGTON, D.D., F.R.HIST.S.

BERNARD M. G. REARDON, M.A.

C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.

J. HEYWOOD THOMAS, B.A., B.D., S.T.M.



THE EPWORTH PRESS
[FRANK H. CUMBERS]
25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings Net

AP
486
L86

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments: by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	1	Introducing Paul Tillich by J. Heywood Thomas, B.A., B.D., S.T.M.	40
The Pastor in the Bible by H. G. G. Herklots, M.A.	4	Myth, Mysticism, and History Part II: The Similes of Plotinus by M. L. V. Hughes, B.A.	47
The Pastor in the Early Churches by Aubrey R. Vine, M.A., B.SC., D.D.	8	Concepts of American Education by John Brown	54
The Pastor in the Seventeenth Century by John T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.	13	Arnold of Brescia by H. G. Budge	58
The Pastor in the Eighteenth Century by Leslie F. Church, B.A., PH.D., F.R.HIST.S.	19	John Amos Comenius by Edward Langton, D.D., F.R.HIST.S.	64
The Pastor and Psychology by H. J. S. Guntrip, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	24	Recent Literature Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	67
The Pastor and the Normal Man by J. Alexander Findlay, M.A., D.D.	31	From My New Shelf by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	77
Theology as Evangelism by Bernard M. G. Reardon, M.A.	36	Our Contributors	<i>Inside back cover</i>

A Good Investment

Since it was founded in 1869 the National Children's Home has given to over 38,000 orphaned and destitute boys and girls the chance in life which misfortune has denied.

It costs a lot to provide for this large family, but the money so spent yields a rich dividend. The bulk of the income is derived from voluntary contributions and an urgent appeal is made for continued and increased support.

Covenanted gifts and legacies are specially solicited.

National Children's Home

CHIEF OFFICES: HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5

AP
4
L 86

Editorial Comments

THE WORK OF THE PASTOR

OUR GREAT stress today is upon the community, and in religion our talk is less about the individual and more about the Church. We have learnt that Holy Communion is a corporate service and not merely an act of private devotion; we have come to understand that in baptism a child is incorporated into God's people, and is not merely dedicated or made to benefit in some purely individual way from what is done. We remember that God's great covenant on Sinai was made with a nation, and that His new covenant was made with a company of disciples who were twelve in number because they symbolically represented the tribes of the new Israel; and we have recalled to our minds the fact that eschatology is concerned with the whole community and not merely with each man's private fate. For a long time we had been too individualistic; it is good that we have at last rediscovered some of the corporate aspects of the Christian life, and it is good that we should go on to learn still more about them. But any strong change of emphasis has its dangers, and perhaps our danger is that the importance of the individual may now be underestimated. However much men are parts of a community, they are inescapably individuals, and it is possible that we are giving too little attention to such matters as individual judgement, individual responsibility, individual decision, and individual need.

It is the individual aspect of men that comes to the fore in pastoral work, for the pastor deals with men one by one. He ministers to his people in such individual experiences as birth, marriage and death, and at such times of individual need as when they are ill in body, troubled in mind, endangered in spirit, or faced with a situation demanding personal decision. It is timely, therefore, to consider the work of the pastor and the ways in which the Church has been able to carry it out.

Men's need for pastoral help is much greater than we often realize; they are much more beset by evil than we usually acknowledge. Freud and his followers have shown us that there are more evil impulses in all of us than we like to admit or even know to exist. The apparently placid, respectable people who sit in our pews on a Sunday are battle-grounds where evil carries on a continual assault; they are beset every day with fears, doubts, desires, resentments and feelings of guilt. And although much of the battle may be fought in subterranean mines, the dust and smoke of the conflict rise into the air above to confuse their sight, and from time to time some of the enemy will thrust themselves to the surface behind their lines of defence and take them by surprise. Sometimes the result is defeat, either private or public; sometimes the enemy is overcome. But the need for help from outside is always liable to arise; for there

are in all of us powers which have been made strong by evil and ignorance and failure, and which we are hardly able to overcome by ourselves.

It is to deal with such occasions as these that the pastor can provide, as it were, reinforcements—sometimes to quell the enemy before he emerges, sometimes to defeat him after he has begun his attack. A few suggestions about prayer can sometimes teach a man such strategy that whole battalions of the enemy are made powerless before ever they have a chance to deploy themselves; sometimes half an hour's conversation about God can clear up difficulties that have been hindering a man's faith for years; sometimes a private interview will remove a great burden, and send a man out into life with new strength and hope; sometimes a piece of timely guidance will turn a man from the path that leads to destruction into that which leads to life. There are times in all men's lives when they can be helped in this way, for those who need such help are not the exceptional people, but ordinary average Christians.

If men's need for help is greater than we commonly think, so also is their capacity to respond to it. We very greatly underestimate the genuine goodness that lies hidden in the hearts of those who to all outward appearance are superficial, thoughtless, worldly-minded, and without any real concern for the things of the Spirit. Time after time the pastor uncovers ideals that surprise him, desires for good whose existence he never even suspected, shame and love that have long been going about in disguise, and even spiritual practices that are self-consciously concealed. The pastor who can find nothing in a man to which he can appeal must accuse himself of myopia; for God never leaves Himself without witness, and in one of the rooms of even the darkest soul there burns a holy light. George Fox was under divine inspiration when he spoke about 'that of God in every man'.

A pastor can only know what his people's needs and spiritual powers are if they will talk to him, and all pastoral work is therefore based on conversation. There is, of course, a pastoral side to preaching and the conducting of public services; but it is a side which is only properly effective when the man who preaches on a Sunday talks with his people during the week. There is very great pastoral value in prayer; but in order to pray for men adequately the pastor must have the kind of knowledge about them which only comes from listening to what they have to say. A great deal of important pastoral work can be done in small fellowship groups, so long as the members are prepared to talk and do not come merely to listen to the minister; but there is some, the most intimate of all, which can only be done in conversation that is entirely private, and for that the pastor must visit his people or they must visit him.

If these are the conditions in which pastoral work must be done, it is clear that the pastor must be a particular kind of person. The ideal shepherd is one who can be relied on to watch over his sheep, who is never far away when there is danger, who notices if any particular sheep is going astray, who seeks it out if it gets lost, and if necessary carries it home. He is the sort of man whom people find it easy to talk to about their personal problems, who is not so busy that they are afraid to take up his valuable time, who gives them his whole and undivided attention as though they and their problems are all that matter at the moment. He is one who has an intimate knowledge and understanding of the difficulties of the Christian life, and has himself fought against temptations, struggled with

doubts, wrestled with the forces of evil, and come out of his battles a conqueror. He is wise in the things of God, able to diagnose the cause and nature of a difficulty, to clear away ignorance, to give practical advice about what is to be done next, and to treat spiritual wounds gently but without fumbling. He is detached from his people in the sense that he allows their right to judge for themselves, to make their own decisions, to accept or reject his counsel, and to take the road to hell if they choose to do so. But his greatest quality is his love, and it is a love without conditions, one that accepts them as they are and does not wait until they are different, that is always on their side in the struggle, and will never cease to be love whatever they may say or do. A man may be a good pastor without being a perfect one, but the nearer he is to this kind of ideal, the more fruitful will be his work.

There are some pastoral problems with which the ordinary minister is not competent to deal, and he ought therefore to know of some reliable Christian psycho-therapist to whom he can send people whose troubles are of that kind. But there are also many problems with which he has not the time to deal. It is clear that no man can study, organize, conduct all his meetings, prepare for all his services, fulfil all his tasks of service, fellowship, and evangelism, and at the same time give all the pastoral help that is necessary to all the individuals and families in his charge. If congregations are to be properly shepherded, some of the shepherding will have to be done by laymen. The value of laymen in work of this kind is brought out in more than one of the articles which follow, and we hope our readers will find stimulus for their thought in the varying ways in which pastoral work has been done.

THE PASTOR IN THE BIBLE

THE WORD *pastor* is an English appropriation of the Latin word for shepherd. Its use to indicate the relationship of a minister of the Christian religion to the people for whom he has responsibility is an outcome of the passage in St John, chapter ten, where Jesus speaks of Himself as the good shepherd. The original Greek, *ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός*, does not primarily suggest goodness in the ethical sense, but beauty, a perfection which can be recognized, and in this context, the clear-cut and swift-moving beauty which comes from efficiency. He is the shepherd who knows his job. He has an intimate relationship with each member of the flock. He calls his own sheep by name; each responds to his voice with an instantaneous recognition, but from a stranger's call they would shy away. The shepherd knows his flock and leads them; for he understands their needs, which it is his vocation to supply. In an emergency he will risk his life for any single sheep.

The picture is here applied by Jesus to Himself. But that it was transferred by the Chief Shepherd to those with responsibility under Him is made clear by Jesus' charge to Simon Peter by the lake-shore, after His resurrection, with its thrice repeated direction to feed His flock.¹ The apostle must make his own the ideal of the Good Shepherd, an ideal accepted by the early Church and by the Church ever since for its ministry. This may be prophetic, may be priestly, but fails if it be not pastoral. The picture of the Good Shepherd was a popular one on the walls of the catacombs; and it is interesting to note that the image persists in the thought of the townsman, Paul of Tarsus, as he bids farewell at Miletus to the elders of the church at Ephesus, city-dwellers themselves, probably little acquainted with the life of a shepherd on the hills: 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in, not sparing the flock. . . .'²

The student of the Old Testament will, of course, remark that this conception was not original to Jesus of Nazareth, but one which was many centuries older, and arose naturally in a people whose history had been tied up with flocks and herds from the beginning. The ideal is nowhere more succinctly stated than in the words in which the Second Isaiah pictures the surveillance of God Himself over the exiles returning from Babylon: 'He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.'³ The very pattern of kingship was found in David, originally himself but a shepherd lad who had proved his manhood by protecting his father's flock single-handed from the attack of a lion and a bear.⁴ Furthermore, the Old Testament contains the picture with which we are familiar, of the shepherd as a minister of God; the outline is there, though the colouring has still largely to be supplied. Twice in the prophecies of Jeremiah there is an expectation of shepherds to come: 'And I will give you shepherds according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding';⁵ 'And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall any be lacking, saith the Lord'.⁶ There is no situation

more frustrating or more dangerous than to belong to an unshepherded flock. In Zechariah 10, the idolatry of the people was enhanced by the fact that 'there was no shepherd'; in consequence 'they go their way like sheep, they are afflicted'. It does not do to leave sheep on their own. In Ezekiel 34 another note is struck in the famous indictment of a self-seeking ministry or self-seeking rulers: 'Woe unto the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! should not the shepherds feed the flock?'

It is noteworthy that this oracle passes into another in which God Himself takes up the role of the shepherd:

As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered abroad, so will I seek out my sheep; and I will deliver them out of all places whither they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. And I will bring them out from the peoples, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them into their own land; and I will feed them upon the mountains of Israel, by the water-courses, and in all the inhabited places of the country.⁸

We are hearing the familiar notes of Hebrew poetry, of *pastoral* poetry. It is the very kernel of the Book of Psalms that 'The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want'.⁹ He is the 'Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock'.¹⁰ He it is that 'leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron'.¹¹

What is of the essence of Hebrew poetry is the premise of pastoral responsibility. For the human pastor is never more than God's representative; his authority is always delegated. He is chosen by God to care for God's people. The verb *to feed* occurs frequently in the Old Testament passages we have been considering, and recurs in the charge of the risen Christ to Simon Peter. But the shepherd also understands, leads, directs, reproves the members of his flock. God who spoke *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* to the fathers in the prophets, was revealing also, by divers portions and in divers manners, the nature of that pastoral relationship which was fully revealed in His Son. The Old Testament is full of chosen men and women; all were chosen for what was in some sense a pastoral task. The better the judge the better the pastor; the better the king the better the pastor; even the lonely figures of the prophets were in some sense pastors, directing and restraining kings and commoners, feeding with truth the minds of disciples. It was also of the genius of the Hebrew religion that it made the head of every family a pastor too, perhaps the most important pastor in the land. When the *Shema* was enunciated in Deuteronomy 6, it was followed by the instruction: 'And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up.'¹² In the Passover itself the son of the family had his part to play, interrogating his father about the meaning of the service. This note of interrogation—like a form of catechism in reverse—is often to be found in the Old Testament, ensuring a genuine tradition, a handing on of both knowledge and interpretation from one generation to another. 'When thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgements, which the Lord our God hath commanded you? then thou shalt say unto thy son, We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt; and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand.'¹³

The most difficult part of pastoral responsibility is probably that of reproof—most difficult, and, in the present age to which the conception of the Church as a disciplined society seems alien, most rarely exercised. 'Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering a doctrine.' 'Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith.'¹⁴ These injunctions in the Pastoral Epistles fall strangely on modern ears. That kind of courage is hardly expected of modern pastors. The pastor must be courageous in face of every kind of human pride and self-satisfaction; he must seek the courage which in the name of God speaks sternly to those who are his social superiors—the courage of the prophets. It is but an uneasy fearlessness which springs from a personal conviction that one is right; the assurance which springs from a readiness to do what is unpopular because it is God's will is very different. The Christian pastor is in danger when all men speak well of him. When Nathan told King David the story of the poor man's lamb filched from him by one of great riches, and met the King's wrath with the direct accusation, 'Thou art the man',¹⁵ he was carrying out a pastoral responsibility. Even between Elijah and Ahab there existed a pastoral relationship, though the King could only recognize the prophet as the troubler of Israel.¹⁶ The position of court chaplains is one which provides many opportunities for time-serving and sycophancy, but Isaiah used it very differently; he put strength into the people's resistance to the invader and enabled them to survive. Jeremiah, on the other hand, was called to express gloom and despondency. He felt himself a weak man, but he was made strong to face unpopularity because God was with him.

Authority is necessary to the pastoral office; yet the pastor bears another title to remind him that the ultimate basis of his authority is service. For the pastor is also called 'minister', an English appropriation again of a Latin word, that for servant. At once there recur to the mind the famous words of Jesus which outline the pattern of all ministry.

Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you; but whosoever would be great among you shall be your servant; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your slave: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.¹⁷

Here was a complete reversal of human standards of rank: 'For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth.'¹⁸ In words such as these, and even more in the actions which proved them to be not words only, Jesus was the *Pastor pastorum*, the trainer of the men who were to take His message to the world and reveal His life afresh. It is a commonplace of New Testament study that Jesus often recalled and repeated the example of the Suffering Servant portrayed in Isaiah. The pastors of His Church are called to be servants; they will not be very effective if they are not also suffering servants.

The tension between the authority of apostleship and the authority of service was keenly experienced in the life of St Paul. He could not fail to realize that his position as an apostle was in some ways anomalous; he was one born out of due time. If he had not realized this there would have been others to point

it out to him. But if his birth as a Christian was untimely, it was, he believed, due to the direct intervention of God. He brought gifts to the early Church which were sorely needed, including an enthusiastic persistent zeal which caused him to outstrip all others. 'Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as one beside himself) I more . . .'¹⁹ Both before and after his conversion his zeal outstripped that of others. 'If any man thinketh to have confidence in the flesh, I yet more'²⁰—and so he went on, counting off on his fingers, as Deissmann once suggested, his old advantages, including the passion of the persecutor. But these things have become as dung in his sight; and now, even as the least of the Apostles, he has a pre-eminence in vigorous exertions. 'But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.'²¹ At the moment when he was tempted to be self-satisfied with the achievements of his mission, he would recall that his cause of boasting was not in himself, but in Christ. 'For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus sake.'²² Once again we are reminded that the human pastor's authority is a delegated one. When he regards himself as self-appointed or self-made he is betraying his Master.

This was the pastoral ideal of the early Church, expressed not only in the Epistles of St Paul, but in the Johannine Epistles and in 1 Peter. The Apostle who had been bidden to feed the lambs and flock of Christ now passes the same advice on to the elders of the Churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia:

Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away.'²³

There we must leave it, not having exhausted the subject, but having perhaps indicated some of the riches that further enquiries on these lines might reveal. The biblical view of the pastoral relationship is a noble one, at once exalted and lowly. To be a shepherd of any kind is to occupy an exacting position which demands clarity of judgement and certainty of action; for the hesitant and uncertain shepherd may be no more than a danger to his sheep. To be a shepherd of souls is to carry the highest responsibility which the world knows. Yet the pastor can face that responsibility because he is assured that he is inwardly called to it by God. He can never be proud of his own attainments or achievements, but must ever be the first to cry, 'What hast thou that thou didst not receive?'²⁴ His life is beset by men's infidelities, his own, no less than those of others; but his trust is in the fidelity of God. 'If we are faithless, he abideth faithful.'²⁵ It is the glory of the pastoral office to demonstrate this daily in experience.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

¹ John 21¹⁵⁻¹⁷. ² Acts 20^{28, 29}. ³ Isaiah 40¹¹. ⁴ 1 Samuel 17^{34ff}. ⁵ Jeremiah 3¹⁶.
⁶ Jeremiah 23⁴. ⁷ Ezekiel 34². ⁸ Ezekiel 34^{12, 13}. ⁹ Psalm 23¹. ¹⁰ Psalm 80¹. ¹¹ Psalm 77²⁰.
¹² Deuteronomy 6^{6f}. ¹³ Deuteronomy 6^{21, 22}; cf. Joshua 4^{8f}. ¹⁴ 2 Timothy 4²; Titus 1¹³.
¹⁵ 2 Samuel 12⁷. ¹⁶ 1 Kings 18¹⁷. ¹⁷ Matthew 20²⁸⁻²⁹. ¹⁸ Luke 22²⁷.
¹⁹ 2 Corinthians 11^{12ff}. ²⁰ Philippians 3⁶. ²¹ 1 Corinthians 15^{10ff}. ²² 2 Corinthians 4⁶.
²³ 1 Peter 5²⁻⁴. ²⁴ 1 Corinthians 4⁷. ²⁵ 2 Timothy 2¹³.

THE PASTOR IN THE EARLY CHURCH

THE CHRISTIAN Ministry is a means, not an end. This fact might easily be overlooked in studying the diversities that have arisen in its exercise and the arguments that have raged over its nature and functions. Jesus Christ made no provision for the administration of the Church after the time of the Apostles. It may well be that He foresaw that changing times and altered circumstances, as well as the differing needs of changing cultures, would necessitate modifications in the ways in which the functions of the ministry would have to be fulfilled. The promised guidance of the Holy Spirit, if earnestly sought and accepted, would indicate what arrangements should be made; or, equally, would enable God's will to be expressed through whatever machinery already existed. As in secular government, it is a great delusion to imagine that the system is what ultimately matters. Men of goodwill and good sense get good results from whatever system they find; men of selfish intent and narrow vision vitiate the most perfect system.

In the Christian Church there are certain functions to be fulfilled: the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, the conduct of the general affairs of the Church, the preservation of true doctrine, the teaching of converts, visitation and care of the aged, ill, and poor, and whatever other activities seem, in the circumstances in which the Church finds itself, to fall within its province. What is of paramount importance is that these tasks should be fulfilled. Some of them might require the service of full-time workers; others might well be done by people giving their free time. Two kinds of division therefore naturally arose: division among the duties according to a person's calling and ability (cf. 1 Co 12₄₋₁₁; Eph 4₁₁₋₁₂); and division between those called to give their full time and those not so called (cf. 1 Co 9₁₃₋₁₄). Ability, means and leisure were the determining factors in these divisions, and the majority of the earliest leaders and workers were unpaid. But as the Church expanded, full-time service became increasingly necessary, and the organization of the Church began to develop into an ordered system. The beginnings of that system can be seen in the Acts and the Epistles. Its present diversity can be seen in systems so different as the elaborate organization of the Church of Rome and the autonomy of the Congregational and Baptist Churches. But what was the state of affairs in the Early Church? For present purposes we will define the period of the Early Church as from the end of the time of the Apostles to the establishment by Constantine of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire.

During that period the Church was making its way against heavy opposition and persecution, and few joined the Church unless they were earnestly committed to the Christian way of life. This simple fact has some interesting consequences. It has already been pointed out that the ministry is a means, not an end. It is not important that there should be people called 'pastors'. What is important is that pastoral work should be done. Today one of the prime requirements in the ministry is that a man should be a 'good pastor', whereby is meant that he should be ready and acceptable for visitation of the sick and for visitation with the object of retaining the interest and support of unenthusiastic members. As things are, this is very necessary. But it has two

sad aspects: it is a pity that in so many churches sick visitation is regarded as a duty devolving almost exclusively on the minister; and it is a pity that so many members need 'jolly along' by pastoral visits. True enough that pastor means shepherd; but surely committed members should regard themselves as under-shepherds, themselves to be sharing in the Lord's work and witness, rather than as sheep to be rounded up and fussed. Pastoral work, therefore, is a department of the Church's service which has tended in modern times to devolve too much upon one person and too little upon the fellowship as a whole. It may well be that modern conditions, religious and economic, make the 'one-man' church unavoidable—one man being expected to bear the main burden of preaching, organizing, and pastoral care. But if we look back to the Early Church we find a situation instructively different.

It will generally be granted, with and since B. H. Streeter, that the New Testament shows within itself the prototypes of Independency, Presbyterianism, and Episcopacy.¹ But for a variety of reasons, the Early Church soon tended towards diocesan episcopacy, administration being downwards from the bishops, and wider co-ordination being through them and from them. The strength of early Christianity lay mostly in the bigger centres, and it will be interesting to see how the churches in the cities fulfilled their various functions. It was early recognized as an axiom that there should be one and only one chief leader for the Church in any one city. This leader was soon generally called *episkopos* (overseer), and upon him devolved increasingly the responsibility for general leadership. He was assisted by a group of elders or presbyters—the two words are, of course, the same, 'presbyter' being simply the English dress of the Greek word *presbuteros*, elder. Then there were deacons, usually seven in number (cf. Ac 6₁₋₃). In addition, there might be various other grades of helpers, paid and unpaid, including subdeacons, readers, exorcists, 'widows', deaconesses, and acolytes. In any one city all these persons belonged to the one Christian community in that place, and all served under the bishop and presbyters. If there was one church building, all worship and work centred in it and from it—magnificent contrast with our small towns with half a dozen competing churches. If the city were too large for one building to serve the Christian population, there would be branch churches served by presbyters and other helpers from the parent church. ('Priest', of course, is a contraction of 'presbyter', whence in the Roman and other episcopal systems it is evident that the local priest is historically to be regarded as a presbyter under the bishop of the central church to which he looks.)

An excellent example of this system in thorough working order may be seen in the church in Rome in the third century. We know that in the year 251 there was in Rome one and only one bishop, Cornelius; helping him were about forty presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, more than fifty exorcists, readers, etc., and a great number of 'widows' and other women workers.² These served the whole group of churches in and around Rome. By contrast, we have records of a small town where the ministry consisted of one bishop, three presbyters, three deacons, one reader, and three 'widows'. Lastly, there were remote villages where there was but one bishop and one deacon. This last class of case lends colour to the claim of Independents (Congregational or Baptist) that all their ministers are 'bishops' in

the ancient sense. But it must be stated that the Early Church was uneasy in regarding these village bishops as ranking equally with the bishops of the big cities, and the policy was to bring such episcopates into the bigger sees, so that the former country bishop became a presbyter of the nearest big city, though it might be far away.

We have not strayed from our subject so far as it may seem. We have already seen that the question should not be 'Who was the pastor?' but 'Who did the pastoral work?' Except in the villages, where the village bishop or presbyter and his one deacon heroically endeavoured to do their Christian work in all its variety as well as they were able, the work was done by the company we have already named. The bishop of a big city church would normally be occupied with the conduct of worship at the central church, with government and administration, and with other duties pertaining to his office which would leave him little time for personal pastoral work. The presbyters, on the other hand, though having ministerial duties in the mother church and branches, were not so occupied as the bishop, and had more time for pastoral service. In several cases the detail has come down to us that in the church services the senior presbyters sat on the bishop's right and the juniors on his left, and that the seniors were mainly responsible for conduct of worship and the juniors for personal work among the people—pastoral work. It may be remarked that senior and junior are relative. It was unusual for anyone to be made a presbyter until about the age of thirty; indeed, the Council of Neocaesarea (315) made that the minimum age, and this became the rule for many subsequent centuries. His more personal contact with the people made the presbyter the accepted minister for baptisms and for preparing for confirmation, though the bishop himself usually confirmed.

We have a fine example of the work done by presbyters in preparing candidates for confirmation in a document coming from the middle of the fourth century. There was a presbyter in Jerusalem named Cyril, one of whose duties was to prepare candidates for baptism and confirmation. He subsequently became Bishop of Jerusalem and was canonized. But it is good to think of him as an ordinary presbyter, as he then was, taking personal interest in his little group. His talks, taken down in shorthand, give a concise outline of the meaning of Christian faith and life, and breathe a spirit of personal concern for his young people. How beautifully he charges them to reverence in taking the Bread:

Make thy left hand as if a throne for thy right, which is on the eve of receiving the King. And having hollowed thy palm, receive the Body of Christ, saying after it, Amen. Then after thou hast with carefulness hallowed thine eyes by the touch of the Holy Body, partake thereof; giving heed lest thou lose any of it; for what thou lovest is a loss to thee as it were from one of thine own members. For tell me, if anyone gave thee gold dust, wouldest thou not with all precaution keep it fast, being on thy guard against losing any of it, and suffering loss? How much more cautiously then wilt thou observe that not a crumb fall from thee, of what is more precious than gold and precious stones?²

And what understanding and wisdom he reveals in dealing with the age-old problem of attendance at church for wrong reasons:

Perhaps thou comest on another ground. A man may be wishing to pay court to a woman, and on that account come hither: and the same applies to women likewise: again, a slave often wishes thus to please his master, or one friend another. I avail myself of this angler's bait, and receive thee, as one who has come indeed with an unsound principle, but art to be saved by a good hope. Thou knewest not perchance whither thou wast coming, nor what net was taking thee. Thou art within the Church's nets, submit to be taken; flee not, for Jesus would secure thee, not to make thee die, but by death to make thee live.⁴

So that problem is not so modern after all!

Another good example of pastoral service by the eminent is provided by St Augustine. A Roman Christian, Laurentius, complained, in effect, that the great doctor's works were long and difficult. Could not something be written to set out the essentials briefly and clearly? St Augustine specially wrote what was required. It is known as the *Enchiridion*, which means 'little book that can be held in the hand'.

The deacons had anciently fewer service responsibilities than presbyters, but correspondingly greater pastoral duties. They assisted in the services, but their main duties were in the practical care of the flock. They visited the sick, provided hospitality for strangers, administered alms, and generally attended to the practical side of church affairs. Tertullian, writing about 200, gives an impression of the wide scope of Christian charity at this time. He refers to the 'common fund', and says:

Each of us puts in a trifle on the monthly day, or when he pleases; but only if he pleases, and only if he is able, for no man is obliged, but contributes of his own free will. These are as it were deposits of piety; for it is not paid out thence for feasts and drinkings and thankless eating-houses, but for feeding and burying the needy, for boys and girls deprived of means and parents, for old folk now confined to the house: also for them that are shipwrecked, for any who are in the mines, and for any who in the islands or in the prisons, if only it be for the cause of God's people, become the nurslings of their own confession.⁵

The work of the deacons was supplemented by that of the 'widows'. We put this word in inverted commas because it is used in a special sense. A woman who had been married but once and had lost her husband, provided also that she was at least forty years of age, could be accepted for the service of the Church. For reasons of propriety, more urgent in a hostile and suspicious society than would be the case today (cf. the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan),⁶ there were matters in which it would be best for women to deal with women rather than for men to do so. We therefore find these widows rendering such service as that of visiting women when ill, and even taking the Holy Communion to them (so says Justin Martyr).⁷ The baptism by immersion of adult women was also usually done by these widows. This latter function was obviously a fitting one for them to undertake, as it seems that in many churches it was required that the candidate should be quite naked. St Cyril of Jerusalem gives reasons for this: 'As soon, therefore, as ye entered in, ye put off your garment; and this was an image of *putting off the old man with his deeds*. Having stripped yourselves, ye were naked; in this also imitating Christ, who

hung naked on the Cross, and by His nakedness *spoiled principalities and powers and openly triumphed over them on the tree.*¹ A great share in pastoral work was thus undertaken by these widows, whose value as general visitors was manifestly considerable, as they could make unexceptionable contact with women and children. The work and status of deaconesses does not seem to have been very different from that of widows, though perhaps a deaconess might be a married woman. There is also occasional mention of 'virgins', who were older unmarried women doing similar work to the widows.

The pastoral work of the Early Church is thus seen to present some striking contrasts with pastoral work as done today. We tend to think in terms of a one-man 'working' ministry, and urgent among his duties is the duty of being a good pastor. As things are, he must certainly strive so to be, endeavouring also to fulfil all those other duties of preaching, taking services and meetings, organizing and committee work which are expected of him. But we might at least learn from the Early Church that fewer churches better staffed have much to commend them. Episcopal systems lend themselves more readily to that method of operation than do the Free Churches, though many Free Churches, notably in America, are recognizing the merits of division of function and make their aim a minimum staff of four. In England there is great need for the laity to undertake a greater share in the work of the churches, not only in various duties on the premises, but in this matter of pastoral care. The laity support the churches with wonderful generosity, better in proportion to number and means than was the case even twenty years ago; but it is not so easy as it used to be to get the laity to undertake duties in the work and functioning of the church. Perhaps this short conspectus of the set-up of the city churches of the early period may show that there is still scope for part-time service in many ways, not least in pastoral work. The lone pastor of today may feel a sympathetic kinship with the village bishop and his one deacon. Would that we knew more of the faithful work men like them did, almost single-handed. But such men's deeds are not written in the scrolls of notability—they were only village bishops. Maybe the records are kept where paper and ink are not required.

A. R. VINE

¹ B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, 1929, p. ix.

² Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, vi. 43.

³ St Cyril of Jerusalem, *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments, Mystagogical Catechesis*, V, chap. 21 (translation of R. W. Church).

⁴ *ibid.*, *The Procathechesis*, chap. 5.

⁵ Tertullian, *Apology*, chap. 39.

⁶ Pliny, *Epistolae*, x. 96, 97.

⁷ Justin Martyr, *Apology*, i. 65.

⁸ St Cyril of Jerusalem, *op. cit.*, *Mystagogical Catechesis*, II, chap. 2.

THE PASTOR IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

PASTORAL CARE in the seventeenth century presents a very varied pattern both as to kind and degree. That there was much neglect cannot be denied,¹ yet in every section of the Church there is abundant evidence of diligent pastoral oversight.

Although there was a common element in all such ministrations, it was natural that the emphasis of each group should be determined by the instruction laid down in its own basic scheme of discipline. Thus the Anglican emphasis was largely determined by the directions laid down in the Canons of 1604 and the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552 and 1662. The Presbyterian scheme of discipline had been formulated in the *Book of Discipline* (1560) and Knox's *Liturgy* (1564), and later by the decisions of the Westminster Assembly. Other groups (e.g. Independents, Baptists, and Quakers) moulded their pastoral ministrations within the structure of their own communions.

Changes of circumstance also shaped the type of pastoral ministry. Thus, after 1662, when the law prohibited preaching beyond the pulpits of the established Church, Puritan ministers were shut out from much of public instruction, and so, in order to maintain the spiritual flame, availed themselves of such other means as were in their power. They made use of the printed page, and many works would never have been written if ministers had been able to pursue the ordinary occupations of the pastorate, nor would they have been read as they were if congregations could have listened to similar instructions from their authors. The same is true of the pastoral letter, and of pastoral service within the unit of the family.

I

In an age when most people went to church—hardly less after the Restoration than during the years of the Commonwealth—preaching formed a highly important part of the pastoral office. Usually lengthy and rhetorical in character, not seldom abstruse and sometimes even dull, much of the preaching, both before and after the Restoration, was intended as a direct challenge to the consciences of the hearers. Lancelot Andrewes and John Donne, Thomas Adams and Jeremy Taylor, John Smith and Benjamin Whichcote amongst the Anglicans; Samuel Rutherford and Robert Leighton of Presbyterian Scotland; Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, and Richard Baxter amongst the Puritans—all these, despite their theological and ecclesiastical differences, were supremely concerned for men's souls. And as abundant printed sermons reveal, this was equally true of many lesser known men throughout the country.

Moreover, preaching won response. Samuel Clarke gives a description of the reaction to preaching in Cheshire. He tells of how folk would spend the time between sermons repeating what the preacher had taught, singing psalms and conferring upon the Word of God:

In the Morning when they first met, the Master of the Family began with Prayer, then was the question to be conferred of read, and the younger Christians first gave

in their answers, together with their proofs of Scripture for them; and then the more experienced Christians gathered up the other answers which were omitted by the former: and thus they continued till Dinner time, when having good provision made for them . . . they dined together with much cheerfulness: after Dinner, having sung a Psalm, they returned to their Conference upon the other questions . . . till towards the Evening: at which time, as the Master of the Family began, so he concluded with Prayer, and I gave them three new questions against their next Meeting.²

II

A fruitful means of pastoral ministration was the printed page. Books of devotion were frequent, and in some cases were of extremely wide influence. A typical early example is *A Garden of Spirituall Flowers*. A simple exposition of the Puritan code of life and morals, it was a small manual made up of brief, plain statements of doctrine, and practical directions for godly living, culled from several writers.³ Similarly, the enormously popular work, *The Practice of Pietie* (c. 1610),⁴ exercised a wide influence. In 1650 Jeremy Taylor wrote his *Rules and Exercises of Holy Living*, a treatise dealing with 'the means and instruments of obtaining every virtue and the remedies against vice . . . together with prayers containing the whole dutie of a Christian', a work which has been frequently reprinted. Alongside this there was his volume, *Holy Dying* (1651), twenty editions of which appeared before the end of the century, a work which 'produced an instant effect in humanising the piety of English readers'.⁵ Two volumes from the pen of Richard Baxter exercised a wide influence: *The Saints' Everlasting Rest* (1650), which reached twelve editions before the author's death in 1691 (probably some 18,000 copies)—'the success of which went beyond all the rest of my writings'—and *A Call to the Unconverted* (1658).⁶ Similarly, John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (1678) reached its fourteenth edition before the end of the century.

There was one work, published in 1657, which seems to have been valued above all others. It was entitled *The Whole Duty of Man*,⁷ and was written 'for the use of all but especially of the meanest reader'—a volume which took its place next to the Bible and the Prayer Book. It would appear that there were few households in which it was not to be found.

III

The work of the pastor had, of course, an individual aspect. Within Anglicanism, pastoral care was concentrated upon *private confession*, as 'a work of godly discipline', and this emphasis was prompted by the instruction of the Prayer Book.⁸ This penitential system survived the Civil War without serious alteration, and there is no doubt as to the frequency of its practice. Peter Heylin declared the accepted view when he states that the clergy 'retained their native and original power *In Foro Conscientiae* in the Court of Conscience, by hearing the confession of a sorrowful and afflicted penitent and giving him the comfort of Absolution, a power conferred upon them in their ordination'.⁹

Closely associated with the call for confession of sin was the issue of numerous writings, sometimes casuistical in character, regarding the nature and workings

of the human conscience. The following are examples: William Perkin's posthumous work, *The Whole Treatise of Cases of Conscience*,¹⁰ Joseph Hall's *Resolutions and Decisions of Divers Cases of Conscience* (1650), Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium* (1660), and, supreme amongst the Puritan contribution, Richard Baxter's *Christian Directory* (1673).

Another aspect of this individual pastoral ministration was the widespread practice of catechizing, both in church and in the family, maintained by Anglican and Puritan alike.¹¹ Numerous printed books were issued by way of direction, e.g. Dr Hammond's *A Practical Catechism* (1644), Bishop Ken's *Practice of Divine Love* (1685), Richard Baxter's *The Poor Man's Family Book* (1674), and *The Catechizing of Families* (1683).¹²

Of this practice we may take two examples.

Of John Angier (1605-77), minister at Denton, in Lancashire, his biographer writes:¹³

He carefully Catechized the youth of his Congregation, according to the Assemblies Shorter Catechism. . . . opening the principles of Religion in a plain and familiar way . . . and if he heard of the breakings out of sin in any of his hearers, he faithfully admonished them privately, and sometimes publickly . . . Ordinarily when strangers came to settle under his ministry he sent for them, discoursed with them, counselled, instructed, exhorted them.

Here is the testimony of Baxter at Kidderminster:

Two days every week my assistant and myself took fourteen families between us for private catechizing and conference. . . . I first heard them read the words of the catechism, and then examined them about the sense, and lastly urged them with all possible engaging reason and vehemency . . . to answerable affection and practice. . . . I spent about an hour with a family and admitted no other to be present.¹⁴

Not least was the diligent exercise of catechetical instruction within the pastor's own family, as may be seen from the pages of extant diaries and journals.

An examination of such records reveals also an unflinching diligence in *pastoral visitation*. After 1662, nonconforming ministers, deprived of public service, devoted themselves to this work until better days should come. They showed themselves concerned in all the passing events of the families under their charge, and the utmost care seems to have been given to the troubled, the sick and the dying. Also the pastor seems to have shared in the family festivals, and, in particular, in special times of devotion, not least in connexion with the younger members of the family. We may take the following examples from the ministry of Oliver Heywood (1630-1702):¹⁵

Nov. 8, 1667. Mr Dawson and I went to Mr Sharp's at Little Horton, where we kept a private fast . . . about a special business, and our judgment was desired in a intricate matrimonial case, which seems something dark.

May 31, 1668. I kept a private fast with and for Elizabeth Sagar, at Allerton, who is under desolutions, temptations and sorely oppressed with melancholy.

Sept. 11, 1671. I went to Pudsey to see Mr Milner . . . now under troubles of mind. . . . I stayed all night: he complains of his sins and soules condition.

Similar entries are to be found frequently in the diaries of Henry Newcombe

(1627-95), Philip Henry (1631-96) and others. Sometimes ministers held services in their own houses:¹⁶

April 28, 1667. I spent the Sabbath in mine own house and had above an hundred people: they came openly.

March 12, 1669. We kept a fast in my house to beg soules at God's hand.

Nov. 5, 1672. Friday was held a private day in my house in preparation for the sacrament.

Sometimes these meetings were occasions either of 'sweet repetitions' of former discourses or of comment upon those heard earlier in public worship from the parish incumbent.¹⁷ Not infrequently these meetings suffered reproach, as in the case of Baxter's ministrations when he lived at Acton: 'It pleased the parson that I came to church and brought others with me. But he was not able to bear the sight of people crowding into my house, though they had heard him also. . . . And when I had brought the people to church to hear him he would fall upon them with groundless reproaches.'¹⁸

IV

Throughout this period the pastoral letter was a further means employed for spiritual ministration. In the nature of things most of these letters suffered the ravages of time, seeing they did not usually assume printed form. We may recall, in particular, that under the stress of inability to preach to their congregations, Puritan preachers wrote letters full of friendly pastoral counsel, this being the only means of spiritual direction.

The outstanding example of the use of the pastoral letter is seen in the remarkable collection of letters written by Samuel Rutherford (1600-61),¹⁹ who after nine years as minister of Anwoth, in Kirkcudbrightshire, was thrust out from his charge and exiled in Aberdeen in 1636. The mystical quality of these spiritual letters reveals a profound intimacy with the needs of his flock, and his concern for their souls.

V

It should be observed that pastoral oversight as exercised within the more separated groups—the Independents, the Baptists, and the Quakers—shaped itself into its own particular pattern. The principle of 'the gathered church' with its spiritual autonomy determined the expression of pastoral care. Standards of conduct were strict, and rebuke and admonition were often administered by the whole congregation through ministers and elders (or deacons) together. Such a record as that of the Bedford Meeting, where Bunyan was pastor, reveals this feature. The following items illustrate this:²⁰ 'Bedford, the 24th of the 10th moneth [1669]. It was agreed that Humphrey Merrill (still refusing admonition) should at the next church meeting . . . be cut off from this Congregation of God, if repentance prevent not.' At 'a full assembly' a week later he was 'cut off from and cast out of the church of Christ'. Similarly, strictness of pastoral oversight is seen in the following: 'Bedford: 25th day of the 11th moneth [1669] Brother Samuel Ffenne and brother Bunyan declared that

according to the churches desire they discoursed with Sister Landy and found her willing to receive instruction, and therefore were appointed againe by the church as occasion served to endeavour her farther satisfaction.' Clearly in such cases the pastoral office was exercised by the whole church.

A somewhat similar situation is to be found in the organization of the Quakers. Activities for spiritual direction and conduct proceed from the united action of the whole community. At a meeting of elders, in 1656, at Balby, in Yorkshire,²¹ this desire was given effect, and the decisions represent the oldest church-advice on Christian practice issued by any General Meeting.

VI

In conclusion, it should be noted that a number of manuals for the guidance of the pastoral office appeared in the seventeenth century. In *A Priest to the Temple, or the Country Parson* (1632), George Herbert gives a picture of the ideal country pastor. It contains the substance of rules made by himself on his appointment to Bemerton. He wrote in the 'Preface': 'I have resolved to set down the form and character of the true pastor, that I may have a mark to aim at.' Often quaint in expression, the work is marked by sweet reasonableness, and Herbert is content to convince and persuade.

Another manual came from the pen of Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury. Entitled *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (1692, 3rd ed., 1713), it was written 'chiefly on design to raise the obligation of the clergy to their duties: . . . in the present age the reformation is not only at a stand but is going back'. Every aspect of pastoral ministry comes under review.

Earlier in the century, and written with similar concern, we find the greatest contribution to the subject in Richard Baxter's *Gildas Salvianus: The Reformed Pastor* (1656). He declared that 'all churches either rise or fall as the Ministry doth rise or fall—not in riches or worldly grandeur—but in knowledge, zeal and ability for their work'. This book is concerned with every aspect of the ministerial vocation. It had an extremely wide influence and must be counted as the classic work on this subject.

JOHN T. WILKINSON

¹ E.g. *The First Century of Scandalous Malignant Priests* (1643), prepared by John White, Chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for Religion, and which contains a brief of the first hundred cases reported. In the 'Epistle to the Reader' he writes: 'The following centuries will make a full discovery of the wickednesses that are among us.' See W. A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church, 1640-1660*, Vol. ii, pp.175-9, 244-8. Cf. also the examination of ministers by the Westminster Assembly (1643-8) and the work of the Commission of Ejectors (1654) under Cromwell.

² Samuel Clarke (1599-1683), *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons*, Preface, p.4.

³ Nine editions are listed before 1640 in *S.T.C.*, of which the earliest, 1609, is noted as the fifth.

⁴ This work, though published anonymously, was written by Lewis Bayley, Bishop of Bangor. Before 1640 this work had passed through some forty editions.

⁵ E. Gosse, *Jeremy Taylor* (1903), p.94.

⁶ 'This little Book God hath blest with unexpected Success beyond all the rest that I have written (except *The Saints Rest*): In a little more than a Year there were about twenty thousand printed by my own consent, and about ten thousand since, besides many thousands by stolen Impressions' (*Rel. Bax.*, I.115).

⁷ The author was almost certainly Richard Allestree (1619-81). For an indication of its contemporary estimate, see Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660-1714*, pp.261-4.

⁸ Cf. 1549 Prayer Book: 'If there be any of you whose conscience is troubled or grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of God, and confess and open his grief secretly . . . that his conscience may be relieved' (Communion Office). This was retained in the 1552 Prayer Book in slightly

amended form, the word 'secretly' being omitted. It stands in similar form in the Prayer Book of 1662. Articles of visitation constantly enquired how far the parish clergy observed strict secrecy, this being demanded by the 113th Canon of 1604.

⁹ P. Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (1668), p.5.

¹⁰ Cf. the comment of Thomas Fuller on Perkins: 'An excellent chirurgion he was at the jointing of a broken soul and at stating a doubtful conscience.'

¹¹ The 59th Canon demanded it, and the Westminster Assembly provided for it by the Larger and Shorter Catechisms.

¹² 'I think these two Family-books to be of the Greatest Common use of any that I have published' (*Rel. Bax.*, III.191).

¹³ *A Narrative of the Holy Life . . . of Mr John Angier* (1685), Chetham Society, N.S., Vol. 97, p.77.

¹⁴ *Rel. Bax.*, I.83.

¹⁵ *The Rev. Oliver Heywood, B.A., 1630-1702: His Autobiography, Diaries . . .*, ed. by J. Horsfall Turner (1882), Vol. I, in loc.

¹⁶ *ibid.*, in loc.

¹⁷ E.g. Adam Martindale (1623-86), who, following the afternoon sermons of his unworthy successor, had 'repetitions' each Sunday evening 'with as much vigour as I was able', taking the 'good texts' and making amendment (*Life of Adam Martindale*, Chetham Society, Vol. IV, p.173).

¹⁸ *Rel. Bax.*, III.46.

¹⁹ *Letters of Samuel Rutherford*, ed. by A. A. Bonar (1891). The first collection of these letters was made in 1644, under the title, *Joshua Redivivus, or Mr Rutherford's Letters*.

²⁰ *The Church Book of Bunyan Meeting 1650-1821*, ed. by G. B. Harrison (1928), pp.29, 31.

²¹ Extracts from this document are printed in W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (1923), pp.311-14.

THE PASTOR IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

GOOD SHEPHERDS are not discouraged by a fall in temperature. The worse the weather, the greater the need of the sheep. If a man has a sense of pastoral vocation—

*In summer's heat, and winter's cold,
He feeds his flock, and penne his fold.*

John Gay's description might have been applied to some Christian pastors in the early years of the eighteenth century, but many clergy and ministers had little sense of pastoral obligation, still less of its opportunity. The winter of the Age of Reason made for poor shepherding, and it was not until the Evangelical Revival warmed men's hearts that the pastoral work of the Christian Church was deepened and extended. When the change came it was remarkable for the increased share given to the laity in the cure of souls.

In the first half of the century, however, the parson was too often dependent on the squire, patronage was abused, and many of the clergy were content to please their immediate benefactor. The majority of the population, obscure and poverty-stricken, had little personal contact with the local shepherd of their souls. Class distinction was regarded as the will of God, and the 'lower classes' had little self-respect and even less religion. They tended to live in a world of their own—a world beyond the pale, where pleasure consisted, for the most part, in the gratification of the physical senses.

Even in these years, when the pastor's sense of vocation was so rare, there were some men who were conscious and careful of the needs of their flock. In the *Spectator*, Addison quoted Sir Roger as saying of his private chaplain: 'Every day he solicits me for something on behalf of one or other of my tenants, his parishioners.' Even Cognatus, the worldly-wise clergyman, is described by William Law as making it 'a matter of conscience to keep a sober curate to take charge of all the souls in the parish, at as cheap a rate as a sober man can be procured'.

Here and there a country parson made his house a refuge for the poor and the perplexed. There were clergy and ministers, in the coldness of the early years, who were moved with compassion for the people, but they were certainly in the minority. (The Diary of Parson Woodforde gives one an interesting picture of the typical conditions.)

The coming of the Wesleys and Whitefield revealed much brave 'shepherding'. In their quiet parishes, men like Walker of Truro and William Grimshaw, Berridge and Venn, Piers and Perronet, Stackhouse, Seed, and Fletcher were true pastors, and such shepherds found themselves able to team up with John Wesley, not only in his evangelistic campaigns, but also in his efforts to quicken pastoral work. They had spent themselves in befriending the poor and neglected, sharing the sorrows of their parishioners and ministering to their deepest spiritual needs.

The work of Richard Baxter had influenced the Independents and Dissenters,

and though the pastoral function was not always considered a major obligation, it was by no means non-existent.

In John Galt's *Annals of the Parish* the character of the Rev. Micah Balwhidder offers us the prototype familiar to most Scotsmen of the period. Though he himself was a fictitious character, he was typical of the honest country pastor of the second half of the eighteenth century. Actually, John Galt based his creation on the life and work of the Presbyterian minister of Saltcoats, and embellished his story from the recollections of his contemporaries. The distinguished critic, Henry Mackenzie, writing in *Blackwood's Magazine*, said: 'These *Annals* trace, we think, very fairly, the morals and manners of a Scots inland village, from its comparatively unimproved state in the year 1760 . . . to 1809.' Micah Balwhidder, with 'charity for the failings of others', was always 'awake to the temporal and eternal welfare of his parishioners'. This, one feels, is not an isolated picture of an exceptional man, but might well stand for a considerable number of conscientious clergy and ministers who had some conception of the implications of a cure of souls'.

The coming of Methodism, and, in particular, the ideas and example of John Wesley, brought a new vision of the pastoral office. Critics have said that he tended to over-systematize even this function, but the fact remains that he did more than any other man of his time to bring back hope and self-respect to the masses, and this was due, in no small measure, to his appointment of sub-pastors who had time and inclination to care for the individual.

A famous quotation from that shrewd but just critic, Dr R. W. Dale, suggests that any consideration of pastoral work in the eighteenth century must take serious account of the Methodist interpretation. 'Never, so far as I know, in any Church has there been so new an approach to the ideal of pastoral oversight, as the class-meeting, in its perfect form, provides.'

It came into being partly because of the inadequacy and impracticability of ministerial shepherding. As far as early Methodism was concerned, its 'traveling preachers' were too nomadic to discharge the duties of a settled pastorate. By the logic of events and, we believe, by the providence of God, the Church, to some extent, and Methodism in particular, came to see that the laity must realize their vocation as shepherds. The medium through which they could best fulfil this function was gradually developed.

First John Wesley impressed on his preachers the nature and importance of their own pastoral duties. 'I cannot understand how any minister can hope ever to give up his account with joy, unless (as Ignatius advises) he knows all his flock by name; not overlooking the men servants and maid servants.' Writing this in his *Journal* in January 1743, he put his preaching into practice on 2nd February, when he and his brother Charles began visiting the Society at West Street at 6 a.m. and finished at 6 p.m. How far the two men were able to deal with so big a number of individuals in the time must be left to the imagination. The intention was there, but the impracticability must have been apparent.

Nevertheless, he made it quite clear that a preacher must most certainly be a visitor. Of Colchester he wrote in 1758: 'I found the society had decreased since Laurence Coughlan went away; and yet, they had had full as good preachers. But that is not sufficient; by repeated experiments, we learn that,

though a man preach like an angel, he will neither collect, nor preserve a society which is collected, without visiting them from house to house' (*Journal*, 29th December 1758).

When he was seventy-one, and when the class-meeting was well-established, he still set his preachers an example. Immediately after a painful illness he writes, somewhat pathetically: 'I began at the east end of the town to visit the society from house to house. I know no branch of the pastoral office which is of greater importance than this. But it is so grievous to flesh and blood that I cannot prevail on few, even of our preachers, to undertake it' (*Journal*, 11th January 1774).

Unfortunately, much of John Wesley's visitation was necessarily a kind of inspection. Names were deleted from the list of members and delinquents were reprovved. Decisions were based partly on the reports of local class-leaders and partly on his personal contacts. Noting a continuing decrease in the Newcastle society, he said: 'This I can impute to nothing but want of visiting from house to house; without which the people will hardly increase, either in number or in grace' (*Journal*, 5th June 1772).

No one realized more keenly than John Wesley himself, that true pastoral visitation must be primarily an opportunity for instruction, rather than an occasion for inspection. Quoting Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* at the Conference of 1766, he stressed the need for definite teaching in house-to-house visitation. 'I have found by experience,' he said, 'that one of these (i.e. people visited) has learned more from an hour's close discourse, than from ten years public preaching.' He had little time for such a ministry, nor had his itinerant preachers much more, but if their choice lay between following their studies or instructing the ignorant, he urged them to 'let their studies alone'. They must make 'an exact catalogue of those in society'. The children must be taught. His preachers must use the 'Instructions for children', but should 'deal gently with each child'.

He suggested a certain routine for pastoral visitation:

After a few loving words spoken to all in the house, take each person single into another room, where you may deal closely with them, about their sin, and misery, and duty. Hear what the children have learned by heart, and explain the weightiest points. Engage the head of each family to call all his family every Sunday, before they go to bed, and hear what they can rehearse, and so continue till they have learned all the 'Instructions' perfectly.

Though some of this advice may sound pedantic and, at times, mechanical, it makes it clear that a social call and an exchange of current gossip was not his idea of pastoral visitation!

It soon became obvious, however, that the preachers themselves could not be responsible for such regular and detailed a ministry. There were not enough of them, and they had far too great an area to cover; nor were they, at first, 'stationed' very long in one locality. This was where the new fellowships of the class-meeting helped to solve the pastoral problem. The Band Meetings, on the Moravian pattern, were intended for people whose spiritual experience was deepening. Members faced a formidable questionnaire. They were expected to confess their known sins and to describe their temptations and their

deliverances. The Select Societies were for members who had reached a still more advanced stage. The sexes were separated, but, generally speaking, neither the members of the Bands nor of the Select Societies believed themselves to be 'superior persons'.

It is easy to criticize them as being too stereotyped or even unhealthy in their intimate revelations. As F. J. McConnell says: 'Confession to a skilful knower of, and sympathizer with troubled souls is one thing, and the encouragement of confession to a group quite another.' At the same time, one feels that such meetings were of use at that stage in the development of the pastoral sense. Wisely led, they encouraged humility and a deeper understanding of their members' new experience.

The class-meetings were quite different in two respects. They provided fellowship for the great majority—people to whom the Christian way of life was a tremendous adventure in which they were no longer puppets but individuals, precious in the sight of God. In the second place, they were under the personal care of their class-leader. Each leader was, in effect, a sub-pastor with a small group of about a dozen people whose lives he knew and whose problems he shared.

To understand the basic principles on which the pastoral office of the class-leader was established one must read the 'Rules of the Society' drawn up by John Wesley for the special use of the 'United Societies in London, Bristol, King's-Wood, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne'. The first edition was printed by John Goodman, with the date 23rd February 1742-3 imposed. The seven main sections, in substance, provided the framework for all succeeding editions. In Section 3 it was laid down that each local Society should be divided into classes, numbering about twelve persons 'according to their respective places of abode'. This geographical arrangement made it possible for the leader to visit his members without making long journeys. The leader was expected 'to see each person in his class once a week, at the least, in order to receive what they are willing to give toward the relief of the poor, to inquire how their souls prosper, and to advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort as occasion may require'. He was also required to meet the Minister and the Stewards of the Society to pay in monies received, with the requisite accounts, and to report sickness or disorderly behaviour.

At the Conference of 1763, Wesley felt that class-leaders should become more effective. The link between ministerial and lay pastoral work should be strengthened. Leaders and preachers must meet together as often as possible. To deepen fellowship leaders should meet each other's classes 'as frequently and as freely as possible'. They should not only inquire how each member 'observes the outward rules, but how he grows in the knowledge and love of God'.

The more closely one examines Wesley's detailed plans, the more obvious the influence of Cave's *Primitive Christianity* becomes. It was a book he read many times, and there can be no doubt that he felt it was a reliable guide. His supreme desire was to see the Christian Church of the eighteenth century approximate, in spirit and in practice, to that of the earliest Christian societies, and he found a pattern in Cave's description.

As the class-meeting developed it became less of a court of inquiry and

more of a family circle. Sick-visiting was seen to be a duty and a privilege, and a further extension of the pastoral office was shown in the appointment of 'sick visitors'.

The history of the whole Christian Church records no more faithful pastoral work than that done by such class-leaders as William Carvosso of Ponsanooth, Henry Longden of Sheffield, and James Field of Cork. The story of the 'pastorates' can never be fully written, but glimpses in their private 'journals' reveal remarkable qualities of spiritual insight and sensible 'shepherding'. Leaders like Elizabeth Ritchie, Hester Ann Rowe, and Mary Bosanquet exalted the pastoral office, though conventionalists were shocked that women should be given a share in the cure of souls.

In the later years of the century the social conscience was awakened, and this awakening was partly the outcome of the new sense of pastoral responsibility. The formation of parochial libraries, charity schools, missionary societies, and dispensaries was evidence of a desire to care for the ignorant, the unprivileged and the oppressed. Some of it was salvage work, but it was prophetic of the reforms which were to remove the causes of the widespread poverty and disease.

The conception of the pastoral office, as Wesley saw it, depended on the importance of every individual to God. Neither class, condition, nor past record outlawed a single person from the love of God. It was therefore the business of the Christian Church to shepherd all souls. In this pastoral work the laity—both men and women—must be used. As for himself—the world was his parish, and all men his parishioners. Many of his biographies have minimized his love for children and his concern for the homes in which they lived. There was no part of pastoral responsibility to which he gave a higher priority.

When he considered the whole question of religious revival, at the Conference of 1768, he said to his preachers: 'Spend an hour a week with the children in every large town, whether you like it or not. Talk with them every time you see any at home. Pray in earnest for them. Diligently instruct and vehemently exhort all parents at their own houses.' It was sound advice in 1768, and it points the way to a revival of religion today. LESLIE-F. CHURCH

THE PASTOR AND PSYCHOLOGY

1. RELIGION AND PSYCHOLOGY

SCIENCE IS the emotionally neutral investigation of matters of fact. Religion is the actual experience of living in personal relationships: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbour as thyself" (Lk 10₂₇). Just as religion needed to learn from astronomy and physics the facts about the material universe, so it needs to learn from psychology the facts about mental life, the ways in which human 'persons' develop and function, especially on the dynamic, emotional and impulsive side of their nature. It is psychoanalysis in particular that makes this its special study. The most important recent development here is the shifting of emphasis from 'instincts' to 'personal relationships' as the determining factors in the development of character and personality.

The pattern of any given personality is not fixed by heredity and biological factors. Our adult character and personality are the result of slow processes of mental differentiation and organization from (or before) the moment of birth. The enormously complex patterns of need, motive, emotional reaction and impulse, and the balance of activity and passivity, that make up the total personality of the adult have grown out of his experiences with all those people who have played significant and shaping roles in his life hitherto. Biological factors are assumed as the raw material out of which a personality is constructed. What happens to them is determined by the goodness or badness of the child's experience of other people, most of all in the earliest years, when his nature is yet most plastic. *Once childhood is over, the forms taken on by his emotional life in the earliest years become more and more set, and his nature loses resilience and with it the capacity easily to undergo radical changes.* The whole emphasis in psychoanalysis today is shifting from *instincts* to *personal relationships* as the vital shaping factors in human development. This is true of American writers of the type of Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, and others, where the emphasis is more superficial and sociological. It is true in a deeper sense of British psychoanalysis, where the work of Melanie Klein and Fairbairn has led to a radical revision of explanatory theories of the nature of the unconscious, not in terms of instinct, but of human relations. The unconscious structure of the personality is built up on the pattern of a mental replica of the child's relationships with his object-world in the earliest years, and above all with his parents or parent-substitutes who were the most important of all those who made a decisive impact on him from the very start.

Today, the distinction between the conscious and the unconscious has deepened into that between the outer and the inner worlds. Consciousness is primarily that part of our mental activity which is dealing with our outer environment of the present moment. By far the greater part of our *total* mental make-up is that which stores up and preserves our past experience of life. Only a fraction of this is accessible as memory. The most important part of it is unconscious and is kept so, for the simple reason that it consists of all that was most disturbing and intolerable, painful and humiliating, in our important personal relationships in the past, and especially in the most formative years of childhood. The things which interfere with the harmonious development

of a stable character from early infancy onwards are any and all experiences at the hands of other people which arouse over-strong emotions of difficult kinds, such as feelings of insecurity, anxiety, fear, jealousy, anger, and resentment, and feelings of being not understood, not wanted, coldly rejected, with consequent intense and exaggerated needs for love. Far more than is admitted, many children are not wanted in pregnancy, and are regarded as a nuisance when they are in the process of growing up.

They are frequently subjected to humiliating treatment of a kind that adults would not tolerate from others without loud protest; but if the child protests it is 'naughty'. Parents very commonly upset children by unimaginative and unsympathetic handling and then blame them for being upset. The child is not sufficiently developed or experienced to cope with the often erratic and inconsistent behaviour of the adults around it. As time goes on he has to defend himself by an unconscious and automatic process of repression; he banishes from consciousness a painful past with its still unsolved problems and agitated emotions, and creates a hidden inner world of a very disturbed kind, in which part of his personality remains imprisoned. Bad dreams, and especially nightmares, are disguised eruptions of this secret, unconscious inner world which forms the emotional basis of all that is distorted and difficult in the character of later life. Good dreams and the conscious day-dreaming of adolescents and adults are a defence against its breaking through.

In adult life, a strong religious faith, a good marriage, friendships, interesting work, and happy circumstances all operate as additional defences. But if the life of the present day is too full of strain, or if the buried past in the unconscious is too violently disturbing (as when the child has lived in a really unhappy home), then repression and defences against internal tensions begin to fail. The result is an outbreak of abnormal behaviour of an anti-social kind, or else the institution of the more drastic defence of symptom-production and neurotic illness. It has to be remembered that adults so frequently handle children in irrational ways because their basic emotional attitudes to children are a blind and unrecognized reproduction of the ways in which other adults handled them in their own childhood. Unhappy patterns of relationship between parent and child are absorbed into the mental make-up of the growing child, to be re-enacted in the next generation; so the 'sins' of the fathers are visited on the children far beyond the third and fourth generation, in a series of vicious circles which it is extremely hard to break down. The situation calls for understanding rather than moral blame, and that is the scientific and psycho-analytical approach.

One other fundamental matter must be mentioned. Each child has a potential nature of his own, by right of which he needs to be helped to develop a proper individuality of his own. He has a right not to be merely moulded, patterned, shaped and forced into being some kind of pseudo-person created by fear-enforced conformity to whatever suits the comfort, convenience, or prejudice of the adults responsible for him. The baby is an undiscovered treasure for the parent to safeguard, not a piece of dumb clay for the parent to 'lick into shape'. Now bad relationships between parents and child always have the result of smothering and suppressing the child's own proper nature, so that it grows up to be inhibited, nervous, incapable of realizing itself in creative

ways, passive rather than active and spontaneous, and all the time suffering from an acute sense of inward frustration and inability to get any real satisfaction out of life either in work or love. Energy becomes absorbed in keeping up a moral defence and mental discipline against the threatened outbreak of troublesome emotion. Whenever there is an over-emphasis on discipline, or a negative, condemnatory type of morality, one may be sure that real, vital, active human nature is being crushed. It is as if, in order to prevent a person from doing wrong, he is stopped from doing anything at all. One adult patient, and a mother at that, said to me: 'I have grown up to be an outer shell of moral conformities, inside which I have lost touch with the real "me".'

It will be apparent from the foregoing, that the psycho-analytical diagnosis of our personality problems is, in principle, that as adults we behave in disturbing ways, or exhibit unhappy personal characteristics, or fall ill in varying degrees with neurotic and psycho-somatic illnesses, because we are *tied to our past in emotionally upsetting ways*, but at deep and mostly quite unconscious levels of our inner mental life. Moreover, once this trouble has been created, our very attempts to defend ourselves and other people from our own anxiety-motivated behaviour is the greatest obstruction in the way of solving the problem. That is the meaning of the famous 'resistance' against psychotherapy that Freud found in every patient without exception. Yet at heart, everyone longs to be rid of these deep-seated mental disturbances that have become part and parcel of an adult personality.

2. RELIGION AND PSYCHOTHERAPY

The above outline of the broadly agreed factual basis of modern psychotherapy omits a very large body of knowledge in detail about the specific and individual forms in which these problems appear from one person to another. Exact understanding of the troubles of any given person can only be arrived at with certainty after a most thorough investigation of his whole history, present-day situation, and personality-structure. Hasty diagnosis on general principles is useless for helping actual people. Yet, while accurate knowledge is essential if the helping hand is not to blunder in misguided ways, it is help and not knowledge that we aim at. We aim at scientific understanding only to promote therapy. It may perhaps be said that at this present stage we know more about how personality troubles are caused than about how to cure them. The art of psychotherapy lags behind the science of psycho-analysis. To understand the emotional conflicts that make a person ill, and to help him to become clearly conscious of them, is not automatically the same thing as to enable him to grow out of them into a stable and harmonious state of mind. I regard the understanding of 'The Therapeutic Factor in Psychotherapy'¹ as the major issue. In brief, if it is bad personal relationships that make people ill, then it is only a good personal relationship that can make them well again. The bad causal relationships were in the past, but their effects are embodied in the patient's personality in the present, and he must find someone with whom he can unlearn and grow out of the old insecurities, fears, anxieties, jealousies, resentments, hatreds, rivalries, and starved love-needs. Thus the therapeutic role of the therapist is now coming more and more to be recognized as the

vital matter. Whereas in the early days of psycho-analysis it appeared to be the technique of investigation that 'cured', Freud rapidly discovered that the important thing was the way the patient 'worked over' all his emotionally disturbed reactions *on the person of the analyst*, as if the analyst were now the substitute for the parents or others who had originally upset him. Freud called this 'transference', that is, the transferring into the relationship with the analyst of the troubles that arose in the original traumatic (that is, emotionally injurious) relationships of the past. Only so can old troubles be brought consciously to the test of new and different experience in the present day. *Transference*, or the working out of old problems with new people in present-day settings, is not confined to treatment. It is a factor in all human relationships, and accounts for most of the quarrels and misunderstandings between married partners, parents and children, friends and others in everyday life.

But it is now coming more and more to be seen that in addition to the technique of investigation which ensures accurate understanding, and the fact of transference which creates a new opportunity to solve old problems, there is a third thing: the positive impact on the patient of the analyst or therapist as a real person in his own right and not just a mere investigator. Dr H. S. Sullivan calls the psychotherapist a '*participant observer*' of the patient's emotional difficulties. This places a heavy responsibility on the therapist. It is not enough for him to be a professional, technically trained, and competent person. The patient needs him to be a mature human being capable of sustaining on his side a mature relationship, and of entering into the disturbed emotional life of the patient in such a way that he does not get personally exploited by it, yet does not behave in a detached and impersonal way that would make the patient feel he was only meeting again the rejective kind of attitudes that first undermined him. To give love without understanding is merely to offer support to a patient who remains blind to his real difficulties. To offer understanding without love is to enable a patient to know what is wrong with him without giving him anything by means of which he can put it right. Knowledge and saving love must here go hand in hand, and the kind of love that must be given is *agape*, not *eros*, the kind of love at bottom that represents truly parental affection, that 'gives' rather than 'demands', that respects the child's or patient's own personality and independence, and helps him to mature personal and inner freedom. Here, truly, we are coming upon matters that lie very close indeed to religion, and to the vocation of the Ministry. Dr W. R. D. Fairbairn writes: 'What the patient seeks is above all salvation from his past, from bondage to his (internal) bad objects, from the burden of guilt, and from spiritual death. His search thus corresponds in detail to the religious quest.'²

3. PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF MORAL AND RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS

The kind of problems that religion has always dealt with are patently problems of the emotional and dynamic side of human nature, of conflict and suffering in the soul, problems of fear, anxiety, insecurity, sin and guilt, anger and aggression, repentance and reparation, the 'lusts and passions of the flesh', the restoration of inward peace. It is no longer enough to bring to those who suffer from these troubles (and who does not?) only the pastoral care of saving

love. There needs to be a fusing of love and knowledge. Bertrand Russell once wrote: 'The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge.'³ That might equally serve as a definition of the psychotherapeutic life and the ministerial life. The importance of being 'guided by knowledge' is clear when we consider that there are two different ways of dealing with undesirable emotional and behavioural reactions in human beings. The first is the traditional way of seeking to suppress them by fear of punishment and by moral discipline; the second is the modern psychotherapeutic way of trying to get at their root causes to eliminate them. It is an urgent matter that the preacher and pastor should understand what is here involved, as is clear from the broadcast talk on 'Christian Self-discipline' by the Archbishop of York, published in *The Listener* on 3rd March 1955. He writes:

Many, indeed, challenge the value of self-discipline; they regard it as the unnatural and harmful suppression of instincts and impulses which should be given free play; to suppress them, they argue, is dangerous and may lead to a thwarted life, a sense of frustration, and to nervous breakdown. Self-expression, and not self-discipline, they say, should be the guiding principle of conduct, and man's true development depends upon his following with little restraint his instincts and impulses, for only so will he realize his true self. But this is a question-begging term, for what is man's true self. Within each of us there are several selves struggling for the mastery. . . . Within all of us there are many selves—pride, sensuality, ambition, each trying to elbow out of the way the others, but there is also the self that God has in His mind of what He intends each of us to be. Of this we sometimes get glimpses, and, as in a mirror, we occasionally see what God meant us to be, but the vision can be quickly overclouded and obscured by the phantom images of the lower selves. It is only by self-discipline that the true man is formed. But suppression of the evil within us is a painful process. . . . But the true self will have no chance unless the lower is brought by discipline into subjection.

The Archbishop quotes the case of Peer Gynt to support this view of the matter, the 'man who was determined at all costs to be himself, to allow nothing, neither mercy, nor truth, nor justice, to stand in the way'. He ruined himself and is then told by the buttonmoulder: "'To be oneself is to slay oneself.'" It is only by self-discipline that we can slay the lower self and be the true self which God intended for us.'

The traditional moral and religious view of human nature is here opposed to what is taken to be the psycho-analytical view, by means of the formula 'Self-discipline *versus* Self-expression'. It is assumed that the self contains innately bad components and that therefore Self-expression must inevitably lead to the victory of what are termed our 'lower selves' over our higher or 'true self'. The doctrine, then, amounts to a demand that by means of 'self-discipline' we must *slay* innately bad parts of our nature, so as to leave the true self free to develop into what God intended each of us to be. There appears to be no ambiguity in the statement, for the Archbishop speaks of 'instincts', and of 'lower selves', and of 'pride, sensuality, ambition', in the same sense.

This, however, is not according to the facts. Though Freud's own original instinct theory could be cited in its support, psycho-analytical psychology has now moved, as we have seen, on to quite different ground. I do not know of any school of psychotherapy that teaches that 'man's true development depends

upon his following with little restraint his instincts and impulses'. What is taught is that these same so-called instincts and impulses are very usually neurotic and pathological versions of what, in the absence of deep seated anxiety, would be healthy impulses; and that they call urgently for treatment. The essence of psychotherapy is first to enquire into and discover the nature of the impulses that a man actually experiences. The psycho-analyst asks at the outset a question that the Archbishop did not ask, namely, 'How do such impulses as pride, sensuality, ambition, and many others such as jealousy, greed, murder, come to be experienced by human beings at all?' He is not content to regard them as innate and regrettably evil components of human nature to be stamped out by ruthless self-discipline. That is essentially the method by which the obsessional neurotic turns himself into a person who may be almost impossible to live with. All the analyst's experience forces him to recognize that such impulses are not 'instincts' *per se*, not innate and natural expressions of biological 'lower selves' in us. They are in fact impulses that arise in the course of our post-natal growth, and they have a history that makes their presence understandable. In some cases they can be grown out of, just as they were grown into. Just as bad experiences of loveless treatment, or of serious if sometimes accidental deprivation, can distort the proper development of a human being, so good experiences of love and understanding at a later age can correct these unhappy and antisocial impulses. The psycho-therapist seeks, not to brand antisocial impulses as inborn and due only to be crushed by discipline, but rather to discover what new and better experiences will enable the sufferer to grow out of reactions to his fellow men that only bring unhappiness and frustration both to himself and to them.

There is a world of difference between 'crushing out' an impulse and 'growing out' of it. In the first case, it is plain and proven matter of fact that the impulse in question never is or can be crushed out; it is only driven deeper into the unconscious mental life, to exert secret and mostly unrecognized influences on character and conduct. Many a censorious 'saint' and loveless 'Christian' is what he is because he has got no further than the unconscious repression and conscious discipline of disturbed areas of his personality. On the other hand, if the person who suffers from a bad impulse can be helped to trace it to its source, and discover all its ramifications in his emotional life in the present day, then, provided he now meets with genuine understanding and goodwill, and what we may call true 'parental' or 'saving' love, he can, in varying degrees, outgrow the offending impulse by undergoing a genuine redevelopment of his personality towards greater adult maturity.

This does not mean that there is no case for discipline, and self-discipline. If no one helps us (and none of us can do it alone) to undergo healthy redevelopment, then, for the sake of society as well as ourselves, we must do the best we can to use all available resources for controlling what is not yet outgrown. Psycho-analysis has always recognized that it is socially necessary to have strong 'ego-defences' against repressed, unconscious impulses of an antisocial and immoral kind; only a fool would regard the gratification of an impulse to murder as an example of free self-expression. But the murder-impulse is not an example of healthy, natural instinct; it is a highly pathological distortion of human nature. Freud coined the term 'super-ego' for the express purpose

of stating clearly the function of that internal disciplinarian factor in our developed psychological make-up. But he also discovered, and the fact is fully confirmed by every analysis of severe depression, hysteria, and melancholia, that if the internal disciplinarian is too harsh, negative and ruthless, the sufferer from inner conflicts is invariably driven either into severe mental illness or else criminality.

The upshot of the matter is, then, that not 'discipline' but 'growth' to maturity is the ideal goal. Discipline is a second best, a mere practical necessity in the absence of a radical 'cure'. It is not itself a cure for anything and, if fanatically believed in, makes a cure harder to come by. Since very few people can benefit by radical psychotherapy, the moral of the problem is: first, that every effort must be bent towards seeing that children in their formative and mouldable years are not subjected to either inadequate parental treatment or the pressure of environmental misfortunes of a kind that irritate their nature, starve their basic needs, and distort their development in such ways that thereafter they cannot 'express their true self' but can only work off on those around them impulses that spring from an emotionally crippled and conflict-ridden personality; and second, that religious teachers must base their message and their pastoral care on sound psychology, and must realize that human beings are not evil by nature, but are more or less mentally unhealthy and ill as a result of loveless treatment, and can only be 'saved' by a combination of spiritual love and scientific understanding. Self-discipline must not be set up in opposition to self-expression, and no true doctrine of discipline can be framed without distinguishing between neurotic and healthy impulses. The more mature a human being grows, the more self-discipline fades out into loving self-expression.

We can state with absolute certainty that the one all-important factor in shaping the growing personality of the child is the detailed way in which he is loved or not loved by his parents. Positively, what every human being needs in infancy and childhood, in order to be able to grow a mentally healthy and loving personality, is *to be loved for his own sake as a person in his own right*. If what he needs is given to him, he will grow up capable of giving to others. This is, after all, fundamental to Christianity. The basis of the Christian faith is the absolute value of each individual as a person in the sight of God. We have to learn how to make that truth effective in human relationships; for it is the basis of religious psychotherapy, and in fact all psychotherapy is strictly speaking religious. Evil impulses are, in origin, the child's blind fight to get the love he cannot live without. Evil impulses will die out when he finds and is helped to accept true love. But we understand more today of the limits of man's freedom within himself to alter himself. Here is the need and opportunity for the development of a true Pastoral Psychology that lies midway between specialist treatment and merely supportive and reassuring measures.

H. GUNTRIP

¹ 'The Therapeutic Factor in Psychotherapy', by H. Guntrip. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, Vol. XXVI, Pt. 2, 1953, pp.115-32.

² 'Observations in Defence of the Object-Relations Theory of the Personality', by W. Fairbairn. *Brit. J. of Med. Psych.*, Vol. XXIII, Pts. 2 and 3, 1955, p.156.

³ *What I Believe*, 1927, p.28.

THE PASTOR AND THE NORMAL MAN

IS THERE really any such person as a normal man? And if there is, should the pastor seek to be one himself? The first question comes into my mind partly because such experience as I have had as circuit minister and college tutor has gone to show that I had only to get to know anyone whom I had thought at first to be a typical Methodist or theological student, to find something special about him, and I suspect that our slap-dash classifications are more often than not the outcome of ignorance. Our Lord called His Twelve by nicknames, or, to put the matter more reverently, Christian names; they were obviously fairly normal, well-meaning young men, if we may judge by the way they behaved, but to Him they were all different. Thousands of people must have touched the hem of His garment in those densely-populated cities by the lake, but when hurrying to a desperate case in which five minutes' delay might make all the difference between life and death, He would stop to get acquainted with a woman in the crowd, who so far as we know, never became one of His disciples, because to Him everyone was different and worth knowing better for his or her own sake. The sight of a crowd distressed Him, because they were like sheep without a shepherd; if only He had leisure to become intimate with them individually, He would soon become the 'Good Shepherd' who knows His sheep and can call them by a name of their very own.

If that is true of the ideal 'Pastor', the first thing we must learn is that we must not label our people as 'difficult' or 'unspiritual' because they spoil our meetings by their irrelevant speech or by their apparent inability to say anything at all. I think of two churches of which I was once the minister. In one nearly half the members could and did speak—sometimes very movingly—in the weekly class-meeting; in the other there was one fellowship meeting, it is true, but those who attended it rarely or never spoke. The first turned out to be the most difficult Church I had ever known, the second in every way the best. We have been far too ready to test what we call the 'spiritual life' of our people by their ability or otherwise to express themselves in public.

Paul's threefold division of human nature—fleshly, natural, spiritual—must not be taken as describing subdivisions of humanity, but of the individual man; the spirit, what Paul called the 'psyche', and the 'flesh' represent rather three stories in one house than three kinds of house. The 'fleshly' man, it is true, spends most of his time and gives most of his attention to the ground floor—to the kitchen, let us say, and the dining-room. The 'psychic' or natural man (for our purpose we may call him the 'normal' man) visits the ground floor when necessary, but tends to keep the lights turned on in the first floor—in the drawing-room, the office, and the gallery of his imagination where he hangs his pictures—what we may call the living-rooms of the house. For the 'spiritual' man the headquarters is the upper chamber with its skylight open to the stars, where he holds communion with God, and from there he descends to business, family life, and recreation.

Although men and woman may seem to be of three kinds, we must remember that many, perhaps most of them, who are not entirely occupied with their natural appetites, are all three by turns, and that there is

much traffic to and fro, at least until 'shades of the prison-house descend upon the growing boy', and the 'bright shoots of everlastingness' fade away. After that time, more often than not, men and women no longer go upstairs to say their prayers night and morning, if they say them at all, and the upper chamber, which had been so real and vital a part of their day's life when they were children, is dismantled and empty, till some crisis or emergency drives them there; then when they find the two lower stories submerged in a sea of trouble, and they have no language but Peter's cry, 'Lord, save me,' they are forced back to infancy. I think this is a fair account in figurative language of the way in which most sudden conversions come about; some unexpected shock, sometimes the result of a more than usually powerful appeal, but more often of a crisis in experience, carries them clean away from their accustomed moorings, and they are surprised into an awareness of realities which the concerns of daily life, the struggle to get on in the world, or the appetite for mental or bodily pleasure has driven out of their consciousness. As Jesus said, the seed already sown in the soil of human nature has been choked by the daily and hourly pressure of their preoccupations.

Too little attention has been given to the fact that several words which are frequent in the rest of the New Testament, and are constantly on the lips of preachers, are almost entirely absent from the vocabulary of our Lord Himself. Among them is the word 'spiritual'. To His disciples He does not say, 'How is it that you are not spiritually-minded?' but 'How is it that you have not faith?' His complete avoidance of the use of the word 'spiritual', so indispensable to us, may mean that He adapted Himself more imaginatively than most Christian thinkers and evangelists have done to a situation in which the great majority of the people whom He met had little or no footing in any other world than this, and so, except to a few like the rich young ruler, who could attach a clear meaning to the words spiritual or eternal life, He saw that He could not speak 'plainly', but only in parables. He therefore did not say, 'Let us think a little while of higher things,' but 'Use your eyes and ears. You cannot understand what I mean when I speak of the "Kingdom of God", but you will see it, if you look long enough; you can see God doing things in everyday life, in the harvest field, in the love of a father for his son, or of a shepherd for his wandering sheep, and most of all in the things that you see Me doing.'

What Jesus did for His 'little ones' in Galilee, the 'baby-minds' who were privileged to see and hear mysteries hidden from those professional theologians, the scribes, Paul in his own way sought to do for the secular-minded Gentiles overseas. Their leading interests were family and sexual relations, buying and selling, the law-court, the arena, the heathen temple (where they sought to find satisfaction for their dimly felt religious needs), and the slave-market; and Paul looks for his parables there. Abstract terms such as 'righteousness', 'justification', 'sanctification', 'redemption', 'adoption', and 'inheritance', as well as the idea of dying and rising to a new life, were all familiar in everyday life, and needed no explanation. But the everyday words and figures of one generation became mere technical terms in another. In the manuals of theology on which preachers of my generation were brought up, different chapters were allotted to 'justification', 'regeneration', 'sanctification', and so on, as though

these were successive stages of the Christian life; and what was originally one mystery illustrated in many spheres of the workaday world became a series of mysteries growing more remote from actual life as we went on. In the generation which followed Paul this process of abstraction had already begun. What Paul meant by these terms is clear from his amazing statement in 1 Corinthians 6₁₁. He has just been denouncing the members of the Church for most unsaintly conduct, and telling them in round terms that they had been the grossest of sinners and that they sometimes acted as though they were so still. Now he goes on, 'But you got yourselves washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified'—not, it should be observed, '*are called to be sanctified*'. Here is no question of a 'second blessing'; for 'washed', 'sanctified', 'justified' are all different ways of saying the same thing. The first is a metaphor taken, probably, from the marriage ceremony, where the bride's feet were washed to symbolize the fact that she had passed from one life into another; the second comes from the heathen temple, where all who ministered or partook of the sacramental meals there were called 'holy', that is, dedicated to the service of the deity to whom the temple was dedicated; and the third is from the acquittal of those who were accused in a law-court, when the 'bill of indictment written against them' was cancelled. We could add also the other metaphors mentioned earlier: the Corinthians have been 'bought with a price', and so are no longer slaves, but sons; they come under the law of inheritance, and are therefore 'heirs of God', 'joint-heirs with Christ'. All this has been accomplished already, and their unsaintly conduct does not alter the fact, any more than the misconduct of husband or wife of itself annuls a marriage, the misbehaviour of a son disinherits him, or the unpatriotic conduct of an Englishman makes him a foreigner. It is true that a married man may get himself divorced, a son deliberately cut himself off from his father, one who has had his character cleared in the court may render himself liable to another trial for new offences, and a citizen of one country may apply for nationalization in another. But that is the man's own doing; it does not alter the original fact. So Paul in another letter writes: 'Take it for granted that you are dead' to your past; act on that assumption, and seek to live worthily of your new status.

Paul's unparalleled achievement was largely due to his willingness as well as his ability to adapt himself to his times. If we had his genius we could, I suppose, find illustrations of the Christian doctrine of the finished work of Christ in home, school, and business life, in scientific discovery and popular psychology, in wireless and television, as well as in sport and the cinema. But who is sufficient for these things? This brings us to our second question.

'Ought the ideal pastor to be a "man of the world"?' In this connexion, I may be allowed to quote my father, G. G. Findlay. I well remember his warning me, when I first entered circuit work fifty-two years ago, against keeping the laymen of my church too busy with church meetings. 'The time is coming,' he said, 'when Methodist laymen will have to be set free between Sundays from many of their church duties so that they can throw themselves into the life of political parties, trades unions, or employers' federations, Rotarians, Freemasons, or what you will—all the societies in which men talk freely of what is uppermost in their minds. The Church's business is not to fill up their leisure time, but by preaching, teaching and sacrament, to seek to

make sure that they are Christians and are known to be Christians wherever they go.' Some time afterwards, when he and I had been listening to a typical evangelical sermon from an ex-President, my father said as we went out: 'A brilliant performance, but if any one not brought up in our tradition had chanced to come in, however much he might have admired the orator's technique, he would not have had the least idea of what the sermon was supposed to be about.'

A superintendent of mine, perhaps the best I have had, told me once that a minister ought not to be too familiar with his flock during the week, except when they were sick or in some special need; he should descend upon them on Sunday like a visitor from another world. There is much to be said in defence of this point of view, on which the tradition of a celibate priesthood is founded; but it does not seem to be supported by the example either of Jesus or Paul, though both were unmarried.

During the last war I was given the task of providing what were called 'refresher courses' all over British Methodism, and during those years I came into contact more than once with that great man's man and future President of the Conference known to his friends as Archie Harrison. He had a teasing way, when the discussion began, of appearing to pour cold water on the fire which I had been trying to kindle in the minds of the brethren. Speaking of himself as 'a man of the world', he doubted whether the average business or club man in a modern congregation would be able to make much of the sort of thing I had been saying. This led to a long correspondence which lasted up to the time of his too early death, and by and by to an intimate friendship, though I scarcely met him again. Partly as a consequence of this intercourse, I slowly and rather reluctantly came round to the view that he was right, not in calling himself a man of the world, for his friends know that he was never that in the usually accepted sense of the term, but in his point of view.

'Ministers of religion,' Rendel Harris said once at a Manchester Ministers' Fraternal, 'like all Gaul, have been divided into three parts: Plitudinarians, Latitudinarians, and Attitudinarians.' Surely Paul, who once said he was 'all things to all men', would have joined the Latitudinarians if he had had to choose between them. How can we even pray for our people aright if we do not know something of the life they are living from the inside, and how can we do that unless we are prepared, so far as we are allowed, 'to sit where they sit'? If it is true that the Vatican has succeeded in suppressing the French Catholic attempt to train and ordain a priesthood of working men and others to go back to their old avocations, it may well be one of the most serious tragedies in the history of the modern Church. The risk of contagion by anti-Christian ideologies may be great, but it is true of the Church as well as of the individual believer that 'he who would save his soul shall lose it'. If we cannot live as they live, at least we can listen to their 'shop' whenever the chance is given.

During one of the Christian Commando Campaigns, a friend and pupil of mine was deputed to interview the cinema manager of the town, with a view to getting permission for members of the team to speak to the cinema crowd for five minutes or so between films. When he was met by the manager first with a curt refusal, he wisely dropped the matter for the moment, and, offering the man a cigarette, said: 'Tell me, what are your chief headaches in this job

of yours?' Half an hour later, he emerged with the assurance that, if what he had been saying to him (the manager) was anything like what his friends were going to say, they could come as often as they liked, and need not trouble too much about a time limit. Actually he had said very little, but had let the man talk.

Men are more often won by listening than by talking. Perhaps when we bear in mind that our Lord told the Twelve they were to be 'fishers of men' (not 'masters of assemblies') we may be allowed to imagine that He was thinking of this principle when He bade Peter take the first fish that came up and open *his* (not, it may be observed, *your*) mouth! Thinking in terms of modern fly-fishing, we may say: 'Choose the right kind of fly.' With most men and women an obvious interest in *their* line of business is the best bait for the evangelist; this I have proved to be true of housewives, shopkeepers, and day-school teachers, as well as railwaymen and miners—the sort of people I have had most to do with as a minister.

Let us come back to our word 'spiritual'. There is little or no mysticism in the New Testament (not even, says Professor Barrett, 'in the Fourth Gospel, where we might have expected to find it') if by 'mysticism' we mean the desire to escape from this world to another through disentanglement from material concerns and interests. 'Spiritual' means not so much 'heavenly-minded' as 'possessed by the Spirit', and 'the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus, His *alter ego* or Paraclete proceeding from the Father *and* the Son'. Here again love for our Incarnate and ascended Lord is the motive of the Christian life. Even when Paul says, 'Seek the things above', he hastens to add: 'where Christ is'. The normal man can understand what it means to love a person; he is more often than not merely bewildered when we talk about spirituality. Perhaps that was why when Jesus commissioned Peter to feed His flock, his sufficient qualification for this high office was found in his answer to the question, 'Lovest thou Me?'

J. ALEXANDER FINDLAY

THEOLOGY AS EVANGELISM

THEOLOGY IS commonly regarded as a speculative pursuit. Indeed, the recurrent criticism of it is that it too easily loses touch with reality and hence develops notions as far-fetched and improbable as the spirit in which it propounds them is unsympathetic and dogmatizing. That the history of theology affords no just grounds for this objection cannot be claimed; but whatever has to be said of the temper of theologians, theology itself must take account of facts, and when it cannot or will not do so the consequences for its speculations are fatal: men no longer believe them.

That theology is essentially a 'pure' or abstract science—a disinterested account of the ascertainable existing relations between God, man and the universe—is, I believe, a grave misconception. On the contrary, it is rightly to be described as a practical discipline, the proper aim of which is the use, or *application*, of man's knowledge of the divine will in redemption. It derives this practical character from the very nature of its object, which is a History culminating in the advent and action of a unique Person, and which is to be matched by a method appropriate to it. Revelation was and is a means devised to an end; and theology, as the science of Revelation, is specifically a medium for that converse between God and man which Revelation by definition implies. A system of doctrine which forgets its proper function and so ceases to minister to the actual needs of men can no longer serve this end. It is then as salt that has lost its savour, fit only to be cast aside.

If theology is thus a way of access—a bridge, let us say—it is imperative that it should be firmly based, as on one of its sides, in human experience. Otherwise its only use and purpose will be defeated, since it will be unable to conduct men to God or to a knowledge and understanding of His ways. The process that begins in an initial act or motion of faith should achieve its goal in beatific vision; and to that process theology is integral. But to qualify theology as 'practical', however, calls for further explanation; and first for the elimination of certain more usual and familiar meanings of the term.

To start with, the title 'practical theology' is often employed as the equivalent of *pastoral* theology, under which is comprised a group of cognate subjects pursued in seminaries and training colleges for the instruction of ordinands. These subjects have acquired a specialized 'vocational' character which has tended to set them apart from the main course of theological studies, to the extent indeed of obscuring the organic connexion between the two. But this limitation is quite removed from our present intention. Not merely homiletics and pastoralia, but the whole field of theological learning as such—Biblical criticism and hermeneutics, dogmatic and symbolic theology, the history of doctrine and Christian institutions—has an end which is inherently practical: namely, the practice of the Presence of God as He is historically revealed once for all in Jesus Christ. The singular aim of all these pursuits is knowledge of a Person who is essentially active and self-revealing.

A second meaning of the word, as applied to theology, is of a different order. I refer to its association with the type of philosophical thinking known as

pragmatism or activism. This use of it certainly is to be excluded here. If the content and character of theology are to be indicated by the term *action*, it in no way implies the pragmatic criterion of truth, with its declared relativism and latent agnosticism. The presuppositions of an authentic 'philosophy of action', such as Blondel's, have little or nothing in common with the activism with which it has often been ignorantly identified. But a 'practical' theology in the sense of a theology of *action* may, and properly should, take the form of a dogmatic, as distinct from the traditionally subsidiary role of an apologetic. The distinction itself is, I suggest, misconceived, or at any rate possesses only a relative validity. A sound and sufficient doctrine is *per se* self-explanatory and self-justifying: to proclaim it is to commend it. That the content of Christian doctrine is essentially a form of action becomes clear as soon as it is stated. Revelation, it teaches, is comprised in a historic fact, in a personal activity. Christ represents the irruption of God within human history: it is from this Event, therefore, that theology springs and to it that it witnesses. The Gospels which record it take the shape of a narrative, an account of its vital stages or 'moments'; and this they do not in a spirit of detached and critical enquiry, but with an aim openly propagandist and missionary: they seek by instruction to convert; or where faith already exists, to confirm it. It will be seen, moreover, that the 'active' character of Revelation lies not merely in the fact of its being a transmission. The 'Gospel of God' is not only what the evangelist relates, or even what Jesus authoritatively taught, but Christ Himself, His Person and redemptive work. For in Him the divine initiative is fully declared.

This truth demands some further explanation. Christianity is to be described as an historical religion by virtue of the fact that its entire content is not only historically mediated through traditions and institutions, but is founded upon an occurrence which is specifically an *action*. The utterance of redemptive love can be thought of properly only as an action. If God is love He is necessarily also active, and our theological thinking, in each and all of its aspects, is no more than an elucidation, or rather a more penetrating apprehension, of the mode in which the divine activity operates. Revelation is thus seen to be both the truth disclosed and He who discloses it. Christ not only proclaims the love of God for us; He is that love. He declares it as being Himself God's Word, the advent of which in time and space is the act in which this love finds unique fulfilment. God, we may say, does not break into history as a *consequence* of His love (conceived simply as a passive attribute or disposition), but in order thereby to demonstrate it with saving effect. Redemption is God's love, shown forth and conveyed to us. The identity of content and medium in Revelation is therefore alone adequately descriptive of the divine action; and this action in turn cannot adequately be understood except as a Person who Himself is the signal embodiment of what He represents.

The revelation of God as one who loves and redeems—it is all we need to know of Him—is imparted through the medium of an historical person who spiritually still lives. For only a person can act, in the authentic and sufficient sense of the word. Action is a function of personality: every deed and gesture and utterance affords us a glimpse, fleeting but inevitable, of a personal being apart from whom they are unintelligible. *A fortiori* only the divine Person of

Him whom the Church worships as the Son of God can bear authentic and sufficient witness to the love of God for us. The primary category into which our knowledge of the Revealed falls is, accordingly, that of action. And in this doctrine, I think it need hardly be said, there is no imputation of pragmatism.

The intrinsically active character of divine Revelation is exemplified in the literary forms of the Bible. The New Testament is composed almost exclusively of histories and letters, dealing with a succession of significant historical occurrences or with concrete temporal situations. Their authors' intention is itself an 'active' one: it is, as we have said, overtly missionary and propagandist. In regard to the object, the *Heilsgeschichte*, of which they speak their attitude is in every case fundamentally the same: they are not merely chroniclers; still less are they historians in the modern scientific sense; but witnesses—persons actively implicated in that to which they bear testimony. They themselves, in varying degree, are actors in the divine-human drama, necessary voices in the proclamation and dissemination of saving truth. Thus the gospels speak, in the familiar phrase, 'from faith to faith', whether the faith addressed be actual or only potential. Their purpose is to secure decision and stimulate self-committal to a specific belief and way of life.

Accordingly the New Testament authors, as traditional Christianity regards them, fulfilled their task under the guidance and in the power of the Spirit. 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost' (1 Co 12₃). Apart from the guiding and empowering Spirit they can accomplish nothing. Thus it is that the Word of Scripture has a place of its own in the economy of the divine action. It is God's Word. The Bible testifies, therefore, to more than its authors' personal convictions and intentions, to more even than the obedience of their faith. Their work is divinely *inspired*, and embodies the witness of the Holy Spirit, which itself 'beareth witness with our spirit' (Ro 8₁₆). 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life' (Jn 6₆₃).

The active, missionary character of the Biblical writings determines their entire content. Biblical theology, accordingly, is not simply abstract and speculative, but essentially practical. As itself an 'evangel', its aim and function are those of evangelization. There is, there can be, no knowledge of the Gospel which does not reflect and serve the end for which the Gospel is given. Such knowledge, strictly speaking, is not *of* the Gospel: it is rather that the Gospel *is* our knowledge. It is the means and not merely the object of our spiritual understanding. In other words, we cannot know what the Gospel is without first knowing what it demands—and in particular what it demands of us personally. Revelation calls for response and cannot indeed be apprehended apart from that response. Thus the theologian is nothing if not himself an evangelist and herald of the truth; his specific task is to clarify the modes and the forms of that response and to educe its full implications. It is an inherently personal task: he, a person, speaks to persons of a Person, and unless we think of Christianity ever in these terms our theology can only degenerate into mere verbalism.

The gospel of God which we preach is not only *Evangelium de Deo*, but *Evangelium Dei*, God's gospel. He Himself is the primal Evangelist. In so far as we have come to recognize this Gospel it is because, and only because, He has first recognized us and addressed Himself to us. The fact of our recognition demonstrates the truth that we actually are His. The responsibility of the

theologian is essentially the continuation of this work of evangelism as the proper response to the primary Evangel or Revelation of God. This responsibility cannot, however, be discharged merely by a detached, scientific study of the Gospel comparable with the detached, scientific study of the phenomena of nature or the course of human history. His words are addressed to his fellow men, who before God are in like case with himself. Unless he declare to them the way of redemption that he himself knows he achieves nothing. For all his scholarly equipment he remains a dilettante.

A theology has not only to be worked out and systematized; it has to be preached. Each task presents its peculiar difficulties, but the second is the more daunting. The theologian as preacher and teacher of the faith may find himself to be only a voice crying in the wilderness. Yet he must never merely despise and deplore the wilderness. It has for him its own lesson. It brings home to him the fact of men's sheer alienation from God. But it also impresses upon him the truth that it is precisely in such inauspicious—and seemingly perhaps even hopeless—circumstances that the divine call actually comes to wayward man. He will further realize, too, that he has an obligation to proclaim his message, whether it be heeded or not, and that he must accustom himself to the unresponsive silence of desert places—to the discouragement of human incomprehension and apathy. It is in this dry and barren land that he must needs raise his voice and declare yet again the Good News which is his to bring. After all, what right has the theologian to expect happier or easier conditions for himself than for the man of creative intelligence in art or science who has had to meet with misunderstanding, prejudice, and indifference? The desert, on the contrary, is the *locus* of his mission, and is as much an opportunity as an obstacle. It proves not that God is impotent, but that man is free; his freedom being the necessary condition of his true response, since only by freedom can God be served. Because men are free, in mind and will, the theologian's duty is one of challenge, explanation, and persuasion. All Christian intellectual enterprise is therefore of its very nature apologetic. The function of dogmatic theology, as well as of practical, is essentially active—explanatory and defensive, a reasoned and cogent presentation of the content and bearing of faith.

In principle, then, theology is to be seen as the active response of heart and mind to the prevenient action of God. It assumes a manifold form in Biblical and dogmatic theology, in apologetic, in the historic confessions of faith, in liturgy and in moral and ascetic theology, as surely as in the 'practical' theology commonly so called. All these signify and express that obedience of faith which is fulfilled in the fellowship of the mystery of Christ. Theology, we would maintain, is a practical science by virtue of its origin and function. Its *raison d'être* is, in the broadest sense, evangelism. Its source is the divine Word, its forms the several norms or modes by which that Word finds interpretation. It is thus a means, a medium. As we apprehend the Word under the twofold aspect of presence and action, so theology takes character as both a medium for the one and a means to the practice of the other. Beyond this utilitarian function it cannot go, has no desire to go. It is not concerned with abstract truth. And it is never merely speculative—although in its systematic working-out it has every need of an appropriate philosophy, so long as the latter keeps

its place and does not become a substitute for that which it is its task to elucidate only. In the final resort the Christian knows that the *lex credendi* is dependent upon and subject to the *lex orandi*. Theology is realized in prayer, and no theologizing is legitimate which is not the preface to prayer. For as we pray so only do we learn.

BERNARD M. G. REARDON

INTRODUCING PAUL TILlich

THE NAME OF Paul Tillich is becoming more and more familiar to English readers of theology. He is without doubt one of the most formidable theologians produced by the twentieth century, and his prodigious output is bringing his name constantly before the public eye. His work is, however, so comprehensive and difficult that many are understandably reluctant to start reading him, because they feel that they would fail to see the wood for the trees. A brief outline of the more important aspects of his work may then be useful as an introduction to 'the greatest American theologian', as he has been called.

Paul Johannes Tillich was born on 20th August 1886 in a little village called Stanzeddel, near Guben. When he was quite young, the family moved to Schönfliess-Neumark, where Tillich senior was Superintendent of the local Lutheran churches. The boy was educated in another sleepy old town in the same part of the country, Königsberg-Neumark. He regards these years as extremely important, and sees in them the sources of two tendencies which have always been present in his thinking and an essential part of his character. These two tendencies are the romantic-conservative tendency, and its opposite, the revolutionary tendency. The first had ample opportunity to develop as the boy grew up in medieval towns with their cloister calm and aged beauty, but his vigorous intellect would never allow him to lose his independence of spirit. The same sort of fusion of opposite tendencies was seen in the family background. The father was a pious conservative Lutheran and his influence strengthened the boy's orthodoxy, whilst his mother fostered his keen adventurous spirit. In 1900 the family moved to Berlin, and there Tillich spent the first twenty or so years of this century. He completed his theological education in 1912 and won the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The First World War saw him serving as an Army chaplain, and it was at this time that he thought out his political standpoint. When the war ended he became a *privatdozent* in the University of Berlin, and this may be said to mark the beginning of his

career as a theologian. His education had been a humanistic one—a classical grammar school education followed by a study of philosophy—but Tillich always regarded himself as a theologian.

The young theological student learned a great deal from his teachers at Halle, but what impressed him most was the realization that theology was a living subject. The development of historical criticism had brought a strictly scientific method into theology. The influence of these years on the development of Tillich's own theology is readily seen. Two other very important influences belong to this period—the influence of Kierkegaard and that of Schelling's later philosophy. Kierkegaard's name was not as widely known then as it is now, but the early years of this century were the period when the voice of Denmark's lonely prophet shook Europe. Despite this awakening, Tillich, like so many others, was not willing to forget his dream of uniting Christianity and Humanism. Schelling's was the more powerful influence, and Tillich regards him as the beginning of existentialism, because he represents a positive opposition to Hegelianism. It was his thorough study of Schelling, says Tillich, that prepared him for the appearance of existentialism as the most popular kind of modern philosophizing. So much for his philosophical standpoint. In politics he is a socialist, having incorporated some of the ideas of Germany's socialist movement in his own scheme of Christian Social Ethics. He was rather put out when the Editor of *Christian Century* gave an article of his the title 'Beyond Religious Socialism'; for he regards a religious socialism as the last word in politics. Whilst he was teaching philosophy in the years following the war, he developed his 'theology of culture'. He lost his Chair in Frankfurt in 1933, when Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. Fortunately for him, Reinhold Niebuhr was at hand, and he persuaded him to come to the United States. Union Theological Seminary was his home from 1933 until last year. He was warmly received, and Union Seminary has been proud to own him as one of its many great servants.

If we are to get a clear idea of what Tillich understands to be the nature of theology, we must see how he answers the following three questions: (1) What is the purpose of theology? (2) What criteria has it? (3) What is its method?

(1) Tillich maintains that theology has two aspects—it seeks on the one hand to state the traditional message of the gospel, and on the other to interpret it to each succeeding generation. The eternal truth of the gospel and the temporal situation in which it is to be received must receive equal emphasis. We must not lay so great an emphasis on the eternal truth of the message that we forget the 'situation'. If we are to prevent the *Kerygma* becoming a traditional orthodoxy, theology itself must become involved in the different forms of culture that express modern man's interpretation of his life in this world. On the other hand, because of the essentially 'apologetic' nature of theology, it is also necessary for the theologian to work within the 'theological circle'. This is the difference between the theologian and the philosopher of religion. Philosophy of religion uses general abstractions, but the theologian must endeavour to be particular and concrete, since he stands within the 'theological circle' as a member of the Christian Church.

(2) Theology has two formal criteria. First, only those assertions which deal with their object as a matter of ultimate concern are theological. Second,

only assertions which deal with their object as a matter of being or non-being are theological assertions.

(3) The third question is a complex of three questions: (a) What are the roots of systematic theology? (b) What place is accorded to experience in systematic theology? (c) What place is given to reason?

(a) The roots of systematic theology are numerous, and the error of the 'neo-orthodox' position is that it claims that the Bible is the only source. This claim cannot be substantiated; for it would be impossible even to understand the message of the Bible were it not for the preparation in the development of culture and religion. Nevertheless, it is true that the Bible is the primary and the most important source. The others are Church history, the history of doctrine, and the history of religion and culture.

(b) Religious experience is the means by which we reach these roots. The ultimate basis of Christian theology is the event of Jesus Christ. This is something that is presented to or confronts experience, and is not the product of experience.

(c) Reason is not one of the roots of theology, and yet it plays an important part in it. Its importance for theology is threefold: first, the theologian must define his terms carefully; second, he must abide by the rules of logic in conducting his argument; and finally, theology must be systematic in character.

What Tillich means by philosophy is a very important part of his System, because on the propriety of his interpretation depends, to a large measure, the value of his thesis that theology and philosophy are related.¹ Philosophy, he argues, asks questions which it cannot answer; and theology is the attempt to elucidate the answers to these questions. This is what he means by 'the method of correlation', and it has been said by some critics that Tillich is important in the history of twentieth-century theology because he effects a new correlation of philosophy and theology. He defines philosophy thus: 'that cognitive approach to reality in which reality as such is the object'. This idea of 'reality as such' is of great importance to Tillich, and so we must investigate what he says about it. It seems difficult to give the term any meaning other than that of 'all real things' or 'everything real'. But Tillich is emphatic that this is not his meaning. 'Inquiring into the nature of reality as such means inquiring into those structures, categories, and concepts which are presupposed in the cognitive encounter with every realm of reality.' Unfortunately, to talk of 'structure' is to illumine darkness with more darkness and make confusion more confounded. Nowhere has Tillich made clear what he means by 'structure'. Perhaps the clearest discussion of the nature of Philosophy is to be found in his article, 'Philosophy and Theology', where he says:

Philosophy asks the ultimate question that can be asked, namely, the question as to what being, simply being, means—[It is born from] the philosophical shock, the tremendous impetus of the questions: What is the meaning of being? Why is there being and not not-being? What is the character in which every being participates? . . . Philosophy primarily does not ask about the special character of being. . . . Philosophy asks what about this being itself. Therefore all philosophers have developed a 'first philosophy' as Aristotle calls it—namely, an interpretation of being.²

It is clear, then, that for Tillich philosophy is ontology. He believes that the

word 'metaphysics' has become so corrupt a word that it is best not to use it, but to describe philosophy's task as ontological inquiry or science.

Tillich believes that all religious and theological language is symbolical. The only exception is his definition of God: God is being, pure being, being itself. God is the being that concerns us in an absolute, unconditional way. Any statement about God other than this definition is symbolical and not literal. Despite this, however, Tillich often speaks as though the words 'infinite', 'final', 'absolute', and 'immortal' were synonymous with 'pure being'. In our efforts at symbolical description of God, we say that God is living, personal Spirit, the Creator, 'the creative and abysmal ground of being'.

God is Being and is symbolically described as 'the ground of being'. Tillich denies, however, that God 'exists'. 'God does not exist. He is being—*itself*, beyond existence and essence. Therefore to argue that God exists is to deny him.'³

We recall that Tillich has defined philosophy as the study of being or reality. We can now appreciate the importance of this definition for Tillich, and we can also understand the ease with which he is able to move from philosophy to theology. Thus he says that God is the answer to the philosophical question. The meaning of the ontological argument, he says, is that it is possible to raise the question of God. 'The arguments for the existence of God neither are arguments nor are they proof of the existence of God. They are expressions of the *question* of God which is implied in human finitude.'⁴ The cosmological arguments show that this question which we have seen is possible is also one which *must* be asked. 'The question of God *must* be asked because of the threat of nonbeing which man experiences as anxiety drives him to the question of being conquering Non-being.'⁵ Theology's task, as it deals with the classical proofs, is that of developing the question which they express and leading reason to search for revelation.

Tillich does not forget that the word 'God' is primarily a religious word, and he insists that it is only within religion that we discern its full meaning. Some symbols are more valuable than others; and the two most valuable, according to Tillich, are those of 'Lord' and 'Father'. God is more important to man than anything else, and man's response to Him is the response of a person to the Holy One. God is Lord and God is Father.

Tillich has not made any clear statement of his whole position on this question anywhere, but a fairly clear idea of what he wants to say can be gleaned from his various references to it. Dealing with the problem of the Historical Jesus, he takes a very definite stand, and he would maintain the following five points. (1) The Incarnation was a fact. Had it been possible to use a movie-camera at that time we could have had a film of the events of Jesus' life. However, no one had a purely historical interest in Him, and so there is not any evidence available that is composed of pure uninterpreted fact. In this sense—the theoretically possible being practically impossible—it is impossible for us to know the Historical Jesus. (2) Jesus was received as the Christ, and He is portrayed in the New Testament as Jesus who is the Christ, the Son of God, the Logos. The Biblical portrait of Jesus as the Christ is the consequence of the revelation of God which came in the context of the Hebrew expectation of the Messiah. The final revelation was not possible without this tradition

of a history of revelation; but, on the other hand, it would be a mistake to think that this final revelation can itself become a history of revelation, or be regarded as part of an evolutionary process. (3) For Tillich the historian's quest of the 'Historical Jesus' yields no more than a probability. This is not enough for religion.

The research for the so-called 'Historical Jesus'—namely, for a Jesus beyond the interpretation of His Being as that of the Christ—has no direct relevancy for the doctrine of the Christ. There is no difference between the most conservative and the most radical forms of historical criticism in this respect. Neither is the former able to guarantee a basis of the faith in Jesus as the Christ, nor is the latter able to destroy the basis of this faith.

(4) The fact that the revelation portrayed in the New Testament is historical means that the life of the historical person was such as would verify the portrait. (5) Faith's certainty comes to the Christian through the medium of his experience as a member of the Church, the abiding community.

Tillich's doctrine of incarnation rests on these claims about the person of Jesus Christ, but the actual doctrine has to do with what he calls 'the new Being'. Christ brings 'the new Being' into our world. In Him essential manhood comes into existence. The portrait of Christ that we have in the Bible has two characteristics. One is that He remains always one with God, and the other is that He sacrifices all that He can acquire for Himself from this unity. The new Being in Jesus Christ could not be conquered—this is the message of the Cross and the Resurrection. Christ's words, deeds and passion are the expression of the new Being. The Atonement is the reception of 'the New Being' by others.

The central feature of Tillich's doctrine of man is his idea of finitude; and this too is the presupposition of his doctrine of sin. Finitude is compounded of being and non-being. Non-being is a fact; it is the ontological foundation of any denial of existence. Because man is finite, he thus 'participates in non-being as well as Being'. Now non-being is what produces *urangst*; and for Tillich, as for Augustine, sin originates in non-being. Sin produces tragedy, but to give a true doctrine of man and his sin we must unite the element of tragedy with the element of morality. This is in fact one of the most important things Tillich has to say—and unfortunately it is also one of the most difficult. What makes it so difficult may be the fact that it is not clear how Tillich distinguishes between sin and finitude. Thus he says on the one hand that for a man to be man he must achieve individuality, he must distinguish himself from the ground of his being, and on the other hand that sin is separation from God. It seems then very much as if sin is an integral part of any developing life. Be this as it may, there is clearly a hard core of difficulty to Tillich's doctrine of man and sin. He can be accused neither of optimism nor of pessimism. Here perhaps more than anywhere, he walks a theological tight-rope; with what success he does this does not here concern us. His concern is to preserve the balance between the emphasis on tragedy which makes man's sin his fate and the moral emphasis on guilt which makes sin man's responsibility. 'The original fact is sin and guilt at the same time.'

Any description of the original fact in terms of personal guilt alone disregards the tragic universality of man's existential situation. Any description of the original fact in the terms of a cosmic fate alone disregards individual responsibility.

The accurate account of man's existential situation can reveal the question which man's existence raises. The answer to that question is Christ.

We have already had occasion to see that the idea of the Church is an important element in Tillich's theology. The Christian's experience of the Christ is one which is his as a member of the Church. It is not surprising, then, to find him describing the Church as the society of faith and love. It is in fact 'the New Being' as society. The New Being in Christ is its basis and also its life-principle. As the society of love, the Church reveals the New Being in the relation of its members one to another, in the relation between it and everyone, and finally in the relation which there is between man and nature. The Church would cease to be the community of faith, should it fail to condemn heresy and excommunicate those who spread heresy. There are two ways of looking at the Church—the theological and the sociological. Both are proper ways of considering the Church, and neither must be disregarded. Theologically considered, the Church is to be described as the society or community of the people of God, the body of the Lord Jesus Christ. On the other hand, sociologically considered, it is to be defined as a group of people, a social organism, which has a religious foundation and a religious purpose. There is no contradiction between these two definitions. As the creation of the Divine Spirit, the Church is a theological fact; but as the outcome of a social process, it is a sociological fact. Both Protestantism and Catholicism tend to forget this paradox—that the Church is always, everywhere, at one and the same time, theological and sociological.

The Roman Catholic way of resolving the sociological nature of the Church into its theological nature creates a sacred sociological structure, above the general sociological laws, while the Protestant way of resolving the theological nature of the Church into its sociological nature denies implicitly the New Being in Christ.

As the social expression of the New Being, the Church is invisible, that is to say, it is the object of faith; but as a historical community, it is visible. This is not to say that there are two Churches. The visible Church is not immune from the finitude of all things earthly, whilst the invisible Church is nothing other than the conquest over the finitude of the Church visible. It is clear, then, that Tillich does not attach a very great significance to the distinction between the Church visible and the Church invisible. He draws another distinction which cuts across this familiar distinction, and he accords it greater importance. This is the distinction between the Church manifest and the Church latent:

The Church as the actuality of the New Being is manifest in history. The Church as prepared by history is latent in history. Both are present in all periods of history.

The main difference between these two concepts is that while the Church

manifest is a definite historical group, the latent Church is an indefinite historical group. The Church is *one* because its foundation is one: the New Being in Christ. Its unity has the paradoxical character of being actual only in and through its divisions.

We have tried to give an outline of the most important aspects of Tillich's system of theology. It is no more than the barest outline, however, and there are many things that we have not mentioned. Indeed, his system is like a vast mansion, full of the most fascinating and beautiful things all ordered into one grand thing of beauty. Our comment is, then, but a helpful catalogue. Soon we shall be able to read the second volume of *Systematic Theology*, and in it we shall see the completion of the system. However, he has already developed his basic ideas in *The Courage to Be* and *Love, Power, and Justice*. These two books reveal the weakness of his method, despite the richness of their contribution. The method is the ontological approach which we have already seen in our discussion of Tillich's idea of philosophy. His difficult language may well be a direct result of his methodology.

His contribution to theology has been emphasized by various people and in various ways. It has been said that his great contribution has been the bridge he has built between twentieth-century culture and theology. It might also be argued that his contribution is the correlation of philosophy and theology. General statements such as the former will not help us overmuch if we are concerned to see why Tillich is important. But it is surely time to say that he is important more because of the purpose and method of his work than because of the particular contribution he makes to the solution of any one theological puzzle.

There are several problems which we could consider in order to show how his discussion illumines them; such are the problems of the historical Jesus and the nature and destiny of man, for instance. Yet if there is one thing above all others which makes these discussions so fruitful, it is Tillich's concern that they should be meaningful to the contemporary thinker. This brings us back to what we said above, that it is the apologetic character of his theology that makes Tillich so important. He has taken the whole scheme of Christian theology and endeavoured to translate it into language that can be understood by the twentieth century. It may be thought that this is no new thing, for was it not this that Schleiermacher attempted? This is true enough, but Tillich's method is so different from Schleiermacher's and that of the liberals that it really has made him unique. His concern is to preserve the extremely delicate balance between fidelity to the *Kerygma* and its translation into modern language.

It would not be the least helpful to close our eyes to the fact that in his eagerness to use the language of this century Tillich has taken over some of the most misleading terms used by the Existentialist writers. Let one example suffice—the term 'non-being'. Except as a purely metaphorical expression, this term has no meaning. Yet we meet this term everywhere in Tillich's theology, and its place there is canonized as it were by his doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*. One feels, too, that the philosophy which is the basis of Tillich's theological method will not bear scrutiny. Thus the strict logical air which is given by his insistence on definition and rigorous deduction is really the smiling face

of an empty *a priori* scheme; and the same *a priori* method is seen in his definition of the philosopher's task, a definition which could have been given by Hegel or any of the idealists.

Tillich, then, is a liberal theologian of a very different calibre from the old liberals. His work will be of great importance in the history of theology; but we venture to say that it will be a great contribution only if we take the whole system apart, and if we put the points Tillich is concerned to make in much clearer language than he himself uses. It may be that we shall see that one complete system is an impossibility. There are doubtless many things to question, but it is equally beyond doubt that Tillich's work deserves the most strenuous effort of thought so that its important implications may be apprehended.

J. HEYWOOD THOMAS

¹ I have argued elsewhere (*Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, March 1953) that this is a tautology.

² Tillich, *Protestant Era*, Ch. VI.

³ Tillich, *Systematic Theology* 1, p.205.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*, p.208

MYTH, MYSTICISM AND HISTORY

PART II: THE SIMILES OF PLOTINUS

All teams with Symbol. *Ennead*, II, iii, 7

AS THINKER, and as practical guide to thinkers in a dark age, Plotinus was doubly bound to make his optimism confront the most baffling of thought-problems, the problem of soul—*What* is it? *Whence* comes it? and 'What about *us* in our experience of it?'¹ We can hear the almost clamorous questions of his students echoing down the ages. And we still ask for the answers.

Like Plato, finding that the full solution lies beyond the scope of rational argument, though reason points *towards* it, 'Plotinus walks as far as he can and then flies' into similes, many of them recalling Plato's myths, or being myths in miniature. Those concerned with the problem of evil might be put into two groups labelled 'acceptance' and 'resistance'. But the difference is one of mood, or emphasis, rather than of doctrine, for the same central theme—the Unity theme—inspires them all. There is acceptance, because the One,

the entire plan, is Good; and resistance, because the parts are bad through lack of Unity.

The most famous of the Plotinian similes have been used many times, and by many who have not met them in the *Enneads*. Plotinus' use of them is distinguished by great beauty of expression and the deep seriousness with which he employs them. Many are drawn from the Arts—music, drama, dancing, pageantry, sculpture. They make their appeal through our senses, and, far from being disqualified thereby as media of truth, are given a higher authority than reason, just because of their immediacy. In this immediacy, instinct meets intuition. Both dispense with discursive thinking; sensation links both ends of the scale of life. So the supra-intellectual world, 'yonder', is deliberately described by Plotinus in sensuous imagery: because the One is all-inclusive, 'all that is here is there'; and because the One is the Good, it is there in its perfection, unmarred by that evil which, for the artist, is ugliness.

Any attempt to summarize, or comment on, the similes of Plotinus must fail to reproduce their beauty. They should be read in their context, and in his own language or in a translation like Mackenna's which has caught his inspiration.² With this reservation in mind, the comment which follows may illustrate Plotinus' use of simile, especially in regard to the problem of evil.

First the *music* similes (beginning with music in the narrower sense than the Greek, which would include most of the art similes)—an orchestra, a choir, an instrument. These teach *acceptance* of discord, whether made by the composer-conductor, or by oneself, or by one's fellow-players or singers. The completed chord, the full score, the rightly tuned lyre, make harmony out of discord. 'The harmony is made of tones unequal, differing, but together they form the perfect consonance.'³ Each player must first *accept* the music as planned, and then co-operate by playing his own instrument as well as he can—not as a soloist, unless so required, but as a humble contributor among many. Professor Butterfield has used this simile, giving to 'the second clarinet' his humble, yet important place in the scheme of the world's history. Harmony demands above all a constant watching of the composer-conductor. When even a single player disregards him, discords *not* planned by him are the result. Then the composer-conductor must himself alter his plan, modulating afresh. Thus the music is for ever *being* composed, by players themselves who both make and mar, and by the composer-conductor, who, by winning co-operation, restores in the final chord the first plan. This is Plotinus' challenge to us, and explains why he rejects the absolute fatalism of the Stoic philosophy, even while he endorses to the full its demands on our disciplined acceptance of the One plan. Let the singer *accept*—even when required to utter 'dreadful sounds in darkness and in Tartarus'. Let the soul use its bodily instrument as long as it is needed, then gladly lay it aside, and 'sing on without accompaniment' the pure notes of its highest part.

The drama similes, with vivid and startling imagery, serve the same double purpose. Stoic acceptance of one's lot is applied with bracing harshness to individual human life. Plotinus demands full acceptance from the actor cast for a villain, or an idiot, or an executioner, because the One Play must be all-inclusive, and because art requires sharp contrasts, to produce 'an endless sequence of comeliness and shapeliness, a living pastime'. Pastime? For whom?

On behalf of the unwilling, unconsulted actors we rightly question this demand for acceptance, and on our part demand resistance. Plotinus does teach resistance also, but in the form of self-discipline. Our own inner discords are to be resolved, our own moral sinews tightened and tuned like the strings of a lyre. And let none of us take our brief earth-scene too seriously. Let the actors wear uncomplainingly their allotted costumes, rags or royal robes, for they will soon be discarded. It is all a Play, and we are puppets.

As part of the universal Play, processions and pageantry are used as similes to illustrate the dynamic movement of the whole. It is a *process*, even if eternally and completely planned. The tortoise, trampled to death by the splendid procession, must blame only itself for getting in the way. As for the onlookers, if they miss the climax—the coming of the King—by dispersing too soon, too easily satisfied with the brilliance of the preceding pageantry, let them blame only themselves. For onlookers should also be *seers*, and 'all the effort of our fervid purpose' is to be consummated in the vision of the One. That vision, that contemplation, is not indolence; it is the supreme activity.⁴

Beauty demands both co-operation and contrast. In the Greek choral *dance*, voices, instruments, and dance-movements blend and contrast. Here Plotinus finds, as he says, an obvious, almost trite illustration of the ordered universe, with its relatively active and passive elements. Then he makes the less obvious application to the individual dancer, whose limbs, through contrast as well as resemblance, through motion and repose, make a pattern and obey his will, which, in its turn, obeys the will of the maker of the dance.

Two more similes from arts and crafts may be cited, namely *spinning* and *weaving*. They at once suggest *fate*; and Plotinus, using Plato's imagery, seems here to stress acceptance of the inevitable. The Fates, with their Mother Necessity, manipulate the spindle, weave the thread of life, and sunder it. Yet in this same chapter, Plotinus makes his brave assertion of our freedom, through 'Virtue, the Unconquerable'. That very *nature*, imposed on us by destiny at birth and before birth, with all our passions, includes the power of governing them. If they are like headstrong horses, our reason is like the driver who is in control. So taught Plato in the *Phaedrus*.

The simile of the *sculptor* is perhaps the most perfect, in beauty of expression, and in its moral challenge to resistance even in acceptance. The resistant marble must become the perfect statue, which already it potentially *is*.

Withdraw into yourself and look. And if you do not find yourself beautiful yet, act as does the creator of a statue that is to be made beautiful; he cuts away there, he smooths there, he makes this line lighter, this other purer, until a lovely face has grown upon his work. So do you also; cut away all that is excessive, straighten all that is crooked, bring light to all that is overcast, labour to make all one glow of beauty, and never cease chiseling your statue until there shall shine out on you from it the godlike splendor of virtue, until you shall see the perfect Goodness established in the stainless shrine.⁵

There is also a less optimistic simile of the craftsman-artist who *could* make all kinds of excellent models, but is restricted, either by his orders, or by the available material.

In the highly elaborated simile of the *voyage* which concludes the discussion

on 'our tutelary spirit',* the spinning simile with its note of destiny is recalled. But now it is a rudder, not a spindle, over which Fate takes control from the soul's own guiding spirit. Even so, the final issue is in some degree determined by the behaviour of the passenger, the soul, while the boat itself, and the ocean (the universe), furnish wonderful incidents and scenes in life's great adventure.

With this simile we should compare another, also drawing its vivid imagery from a vessel at sea. The steersman of a storm-tossed ship is so intent on saving it that he forgets his own interest, and never thinks that he is in danger of being dragged down with the vessel. Here, the soul (in its essential, highest phase) has a much more responsible part to play as pilot. And here we are confronted with the profound mystery of incarnation, in wrestling with which Plotinus sometimes so nearly approaches the Christian faith. The pilot is ready to lose his life to save the vessel in which he has embarked. Plotinus admires his devotion, yet seems to question his wisdom. Elsewhere he deliberates carefully whether the descent of Soul from the intelligible to the visible world was a foolish fault or a supreme necessity. The higher *must* quit the Highest, to create a new reflection of that Highest in the lower; the whole plan of the Plotinian philosophy requires it. 'After the First, a second'—down to the lowest depths. If the 'Fall' is a fault, it is inevitable.

Thus the Tutelary Spirit co-operates with Necessity, and both are, for Plotinus, Providence, individual and universal. He ends the discussion of Providence with this compromise: 'We are overruled by the Reason-Principle, and yet subject to Necessity.' The Reason-Principle being our own essential nature, we are thus far free, but only thus far. Providence, refusing to sacrifice the unity of the one plan to the caprice of puppet actors or temperamental passengers, yet allows them a measure of free play and creative activity according to their skill and fitness. Let them be content.

But we are not content. We still protest, defiantly, with Omar Khayyám, or more humbly with Myers's St Paul—

*What, without asking, hither hurried whence?
And, without asking, whither hurried hence!
Another and another Cup to drown
The Memory of this Impertinence!*

(Fitzgerald's *Omar Khayyám*).

*Therefore have pity! Not that we accuse thee,
Curse thee, and die, and charge thee with our woe:
Not thro' thy fault, O Holy One, we lose thee,
Nay, but our own—yet thou hast made us so!*

(F. W. H. Myers, *St Paul*).

We rail, or plead, against the evil in our lot, especially against that part of it assigned to us at birth or before birth, and against our blank ignorance of the whole plan, or voyage, and of the significance of our own infinitesimal part in it. We are not content; and doubtless the students in Plotinus' classroom were often dissatisfied with his logic. Yet, like them, and like Dean Inge, we can

find, on every return to him, illumination, guidance in living, and practical help in facing the problem of evil.

The Plotinian Trinity—the One, Divine Mind, Soul—is sometimes pictured for us as a diagram of concentric circles, soul being the outermost and receiving its light and life from the One, both directly, and indirectly through Divine Mind. Outside these three essential beings of the Intelligible world is the remoter, less real, cosmos—the physical universe. Into this also the light emanates from the One, with lessening brilliance as it travels further and further into bodies. But this diagram, suggesting that Soul is wrapped round by the physical universe, and that our individual souls are inside our bodies, is corrected carefully by other similes which demonstrate soul as *container* rather than contained. Soul is *not* like wine in jars; it is more like the ocean, in which the cosmos floats like a net. 'The soul bears it up, and it lies within . . . not possessor, but possessed.'

Soul, the third hypostasis, lowest in the Intelligible world, highest in the physical, is the *Interpreter* of one world to the other; it lives in both. No wonder that Plotinus whose philosophy of immanence and optimism centres on the unity of the two worlds, devotes so much time and care to psychology and 'problems of the soul'. The whole of the fourth Ennead is occupied with them, and probably contains much of that three days' questioning inflicted on him by Porphyry—'How the soul is associated with body'.⁷ It is the soul that is the 'prisoner in golden fetters'. But soul not only consents to be imprisoned; 'it *leaps*' down to its prison-house at birth, 'as at the voice of a herald'. It falls in love with its own image, mirrored in the world below. Is this freedom or fate? Plotinus, as often, sums up with a compromise that is paradox. 'The souls go forth neither under compulsion nor of free will.' They are 'in travail' till they can bring forth their own copy of their spiritual prototype.

Soul can mediate and interpret just because of its own inner disparity. It is tripartite, linked with the Intelligible world, linked with the physical world, and having a midway phase by which it resolves its own inner conflicts.

But its true home is 'yonder'. On earth, it is a 'fugitive' and homesick. The picture of the arrogant, self-seeking 'fall' is balanced by the picture of the soaring, striving wings (Plotinus again borrows the imagery of the Phaedrus, as in the simile of the two-horsed chariot). All the desire of the souls is upwards, but not all can endure the arduous flight. Wings that would reach the One are weighted with the manifold and the material.

Other similes illustrate the *reconciliation* of the One with the Many—one face, with distinct features; one tree, with many branches; one body, with many members. The good doctor, while tending the injured part, treats the body as a *whole*; and all the parts, seeking their own good, are seeking the One. The nearer the sun, the clearer the light; the nearer the fire, the greater the warmth; the nearer the source, the purer the stream—these are the often repeated and obvious similes which combine emanation with immanence. There is no sheer severance, but endless degrees of permeation and union. Or again, 'we may imagine a thick waxen seal in which the imprint has penetrated to the very uttermost film so as to show on both sides, sharp cut on the upper surface, faint on the under'; thus does Wisdom, derived from the One, penetrate to the Nature of the physical world.

Another kind of simile draws its imagery from human relationships. These similes, intimate and poignant, are a valuable corrective of these bleak descriptions of the One which, by abstraction, deprive it of all qualities, or rather, forbid us to describe it at all except as the One. Plotinus, like many religious mystics, combines this extreme of barren negation with intense personal emotion and devotion. In the similes now to be considered he is surely giving us not merely beautiful imagery, but his own inner conviction.

The note of homecoming and homesickness, sounded so often, symbolizes the whole structure of his philosophy. Soul, the third hypostasis in the Plotinian Trinity, twice removed from the One, is seeking the beloved fatherland, like Ulysses, the wanderer. It is the lost child seeking its father, the frightened child needing the father's loving rebuke for its fear. It is the 'noble daughter', degraded by her earthly sojourn, restored to her 'kingly father'. Our best thoughts here, our purest music here, are homesick 'fugitives', echoes of their prototypes, the 'unheard harmonies yonder'.

Other similes tell of the perils of the earthly exile, of the need of persevering effort, patient vigil, or hard conflict. The climber must strain to the last steep ascent. The watchers for the dawn must wait for the crowning splendour of the sun. Our inner disorder, our clamorous desires, must be subdued to quiet by our own reasonable spirit, like a disorderly meeting that consents at last to give the wise speaker a hearing.

Our soul, in its labour of self-mastery, is as a woman in travail. In its accumulation of bodily qualities and material possessions (each new addition being a *loss*) it is like Glaucus, the sea-god, overgrown with shell and seaweed; or like a man emerging from a bog, all slime and filth, his *native* beauty unrecognizable till restored by much cleansing.

All these similes teach resistance, or persistence, rather than acceptance of an evil plight. But what of his simile of the 'Generalissimo', in supreme command of the army? Does not this counsel blind acceptance and obedience, totalitarianism, and a philosophy dangerously stressing transcendence? Plotinus uses this simile with caution, seeking to combine the Immanence of Divine Mind (Nous) with the transcendence of the One. The Chief of Staff must have the co-operation of the rank and file; and even *he* is not in absolute control of the battle, for he cannot foresee every move of the enemy. 'But where the mighty general is in question, whose power extends over all that is, what can pass unordered, what can fail to fit into the plan?' Even with this explanation, the military simile is hardly in keeping with the main structure of Plotinus' thought, which is immanent more than transcendent, and based on order through inner, willed co-operation, not on order imposed from without.

A philosophy of immanence also lies behind those similes which stress the worth and beauty of the physical universe and the different ways in which human beings react to it. These similes are specially directed against the Gnostics, with their contempt of this world and disparagement of *natural* human goodness.

*Two men looked out from prison bars;
The one saw mud, the other stars.*

Plotinus puts his two men into 'one stately house'. 'One of them declaims

against its plan and against its Architect, but none the less retains his residence in it; the other makes no complaint, asserts the entire competency of the Architect, and waits cheerfully for the day when he may leave it, having no further need of a house.'

Another simile finds this difference of reaction within the individual soul. These two selves, our better and our worse, live in two houses, but next door to each other. So different, yet so close, are these two selves that the nearness of the good shames the bad into decent behaviour, or even into imitation of the nobler next-door neighbour.

The tractate on evil ends with a mysterious, probing simile, of hope, comfort, and compassion. Here on earth we are prisoners, fettered with *chains of gold*.

Evil is not evil only: it appears, necessarily, bound around with bonds of Beauty, like some captive bound around with fetters of gold; and beneath these it is hidden, so that, while it must exist, it may not be seen by the gods, and that men need not always have evil before their eyes, but that when it comes before them they may still be not destitute of Images of the Good and Beautiful for their Remembrance (18, 15).

Plotinus will not leave one iota of existence unredeemed. His practical guidance in this simile is in tune with our best 'modern' educational reforms in school or prison. Overcome evil with good. When confronted with it within yourself, contemplate whatsoever things are lovely in this world, and 'remember' the beauty once seen in the home-land. Once we beheld absolute Beauty, but have forgotten it in our exile. Here we have seen only *reflected* beauty as in a mirror, and in many forms as one mirror reflects many objects.

The simile of *reflected images*, in a mirror or in water, is for Plotinus more than symbol; it is as near as he can get to *fact*. (He would not have his portrait painted because it would only be 'the image of an image'.) But beautiful things seen here can move us with mysterious attractive power, because if they are good reflectors, they awaken memories of our home and quicken desire for return. There, 'yonder', we once beheld the perfect models. We—our real selves—are destined to see them again, 'beautiful beyond the beauty of Evening and of Dawn'.

M. L. V. HUGHES

¹ See especially *Enneads*, I, viii, III, ii.

² This is mainly used in this article, and by Grace Turnbull, *The Essence of Plotinus*, which includes many of the finest similes.

³ Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity and History*.

⁴ Here Plotinus is at one with Aristotle, with whom he so often disagrees.

⁵ Grace Turnbull—herself a sculptor—has chosen this passage to complete the Introduction to her book, *The Essence of Plotinus*, p. xx.

⁶ The Tutelary Spirit (*δαίμων*) is Providence personified, caring for each individual—a sort of Guardian Angel. In this simile, the *boat* is differently understood by translators, the Greek being ambiguous—Mackenna makes it 'the skiff of the Universe'.

⁷ *Life of Plotinus*, Chap. 13.

CONCEPTS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL ideals differ fundamentally from those in Britain and on the Continent. That this should be so stems directly from the history of America's development and from the vastly different conditions that are found there. In fact, in a European sense, the American system is not educational at all. Rather is it a social training whereby children both learn to be American citizens and to acquire some of the graces and knowledge that will help them later in life. It is therefore rather unfair for Europeans to compare educational attainments in America with those in their own country, just as it is somewhat ludicrous for Americans to evaluate their own methods by a simple quantitative comparison of university students and school-leaving age. The two methods, the European and the American, have grown up in different soils and have yielded different fruits.

The American concepts may best be illustrated by considering the history of the country over the last hundred years. In the 1850's, America was still mainly agricultural and of British extraction ethnically. The floods of immigrants, however, were beginning to arrive, and the rapid industrialization of the country was already under way. It must also be remembered that millions of acres had still not been settled, and that the frontier was still a very important part in American life. Thus the turmoil and big social changes that came to Britain as a result of her Industrial Revolution came also to America, but with greater force. One of the basic social needs was to teach the foreign-born children to speak and write English and to develop a new sense of nationality. The difficulties attending this may be well understood when it is remembered that the parents themselves hardly ever learned to speak English properly. The children were faced with one language at home and a different one at school; with one code of behaviour at home and another set of moral precepts at school. This by itself would have made the task difficult enough in all conscience, but the children were of different nationalities, and the geographical mobility of the immigrants in many cases meant that the children attended both irregularly and at many different schools. Educational facilities at that time were also meagre as compared with those available today. The result was a very simple type of training, not basically educational, but with the aim of moulding all children into a recognizable American shape, speaking English and glorying in the American flag.

Another major difference between Europe and America lies in the 'public control' of education in the latter country. It is true, of course, that the public in Britain have a say—and a major say—in the type and quality of education provided by the schools and universities. But in America there is in a definite practical way 'public control' of educational facilities. Whereas in Britain policies are administered from a central authority, in America there is both control from the State and a very keen local interest in school building, appointment of teachers, curricula, and facilities. Thus in many cases local opinion is of considerably greater importance than State edicts.

The educational system had also to take into account the lack of various educational factors that played a fairly important role in other countries. There has never been in America the home training and reading that in Britain both

encourages the children and supplements their normal lessons. Thus right from the very beginning American schools have had to face many difficulties and to operate in circumstances vastly different from those prevailing in more settled countries. The separation of Church and State has also led to the abolishing, more or less, of religious training in the schools. Such activities have tended to be taken over by religious bodies and Sunday schools, which in general play a more important role in education than similar bodies in Britain.

Apart from the need for a training in English and a new nationality, there was also a tendency right from the beginning to specialize in practical subjects. The circumstances of life in a new and in many ways a raw country may well be imagined, as may be also the immediate needs in community life. This tendency has carried on right to the present day, and millions of American students have been helped to acquire degrees by studying wood-working, dancing, and many other subjects which in Britain and on the Continent have never been regarded as intellectual at all.

A similar state of affairs prevails in the elementary schools, where small children have lessons in how to use the lavatory, and older ones are taught the dangers of alcohol and how to avoid becoming drug addicts. Such studies might well raise a smile in Britain, but they are regarded in America as eminently suitable work for the schools. The lack of a stable and educational home life and the enormous difficulties caused by having to teach children of many different nationalities have made such training in the schools urgently necessary. It is true that with the ending of mass immigration after World War I a more stable society might have arisen. Other factors, however, have come on the scene. One is the increasing mobility of Americans caused by the possession of a motor car. Another is the growth from early years of a strong belief in the individual and a great unwillingness to interfere either at home or in the schools with a child's desires. This emphasis on the individual and his right to have his own way with as little control as possible has led to a family and social life which from the British standpoint is clearly chaotic. An American woman returning after a trip to Britain said that the quiet orderliness of home life in Britain compared favourably with the 'rat-race' atmosphere of domestic life in America. The vast increase in juvenile delinquency and youthful vandalism stems directly from this concept of individualistic rather than group life. It also accounts for the growth in the so-called progressive educational ideas whereby the children choose the subjects they like best instead of being trained in those studies which in other countries are regarded as a more suitable basis for citizenship.

The provision of education in America is not directly a function of the Federal Government. It is a state matter, and the facilities provided by the various states range from practically none at all for some of the rural Negroes in the Deep South to training as good as anywhere else in the world in many schools and universities from New England to California. The American school system comprises grade school, high school, and college. Eight years are generally spent in grade school, from the age of six to fourteen. There are four years of high school. The impression has gained ground that most American students have the chance nowadays of a college or university education. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Over 50 per cent. of the scholars

leave school, never to return, at the legal age of leaving, generally sixteen. Such scholars have the same educational standing, for the reasons mentioned above, as scholars in Britain of from thirteen to fourteen. They have, however, completed about two years of high school education as measured on the American educational scale. Another 25 per cent. of the scholars complete from three to four years at high school, thus achieving the educational level of scholars of from fifteen to seventeen years old in Britain. About 20 per cent. of American scholars go on to a college or university, but less than 50 per cent. finish the course and 'graduate'. In fact, the number of scholars in the third year of college is only one-half of the number in the first year. The majority of such students take one, two, or three years at a university and then leave without taking a degree. Thus while the possession of a degree has now come to be looked on in America as more or less the opening to a professional career, there is not the urge to acquire one as might be thought from a survey of American comment on this subject.

Educational circles in America freely admit that many of the so-called colleges and universities do not provide the equivalent of the training given in British universities. The President of one well-known and famous American university stated that only 5 per cent. of American universities came up to the British and European standards. Thus the percentage of scholars obtaining a first-class education is considerably smaller in America than in Britain. The American method scores in one important respect, however, by providing more scholars with just that extra year or two of training which makes all the difference, especially in technical or vocational subjects. There is also a greater demand in America for a doctor's degree, as this is now more or less the 'union card' in academic circles. The relations between the universities and industry are far more cordial in America than in Britain, and there is a greater willingness for the universities to provide what industry requires.

A lot has been said in Britain about the general unwillingness of employers to accept arts graduates, or even technical graduates. Little has been said, however, about the great difference between the attitudes of the British graduate and the American. The American graduate has not only had four years' training at a university, but has spent a large part of his vacations and a lot of his spare time in acquiring practical experience. He is generally very willing to start at the bottom in industry, and to work exceedingly hard, both in business and by taking further courses in the evening to make himself suitable for rapid promotion. After several years in such work he may well be considered for a higher executive or administrative position, and his firm may finance an appropriate course at such a school as the Harvard Business School. The down-to-earth approach in America may be gauged from the remarks of one executive who said: 'When a graduate comes job-hunting, I expect him to tell me how he can be useful to me. Then I tell him how I can be useful to him.' Although it is true that many university graduates start at a salary sufficient to keep a married man, there is in general no belief on their part that their university training immediately entitles them to large rewards. In fact, because of the early age of marriage in America, possibly the majority of the wives of such graduates both continue to work after marriage and to assist their husbands as much as possible in their evening studies.

Many of the women's colleges are in fact similar to finishing schools. The standard of education reached even by eighteen- and nineteen-year-old girls in America seldom goes beyond that achieved by sixteen-year-olds in Britain. The social life on the 'campus' is quite often regarded by both men and women as the more important aspect of university life, and there are indeed really two types of lives at American universities—the social life and the 'grind'. The type of training given at American universities differs considerably from that normal in Britain. Both the 'credit' system and the 'quizzes' tend to breed a superficial attitude and knowledge, combined with a certain glibness and self-assurance. The credit system is a typically American method of evaluating educational achievement on a relatively simple mathematical system. 'Points' or 'credits' are awarded for completed studies in the various subjects. A certain number of points is required for success. A quiz is the usual examination by questioning, and as these take place at fairly regular intervals there is a tendency to emphasize quick answers at the expense of real thought. The two ideas are, however, in line with American beliefs and practices. Americans tend to shy away from qualitative evaluations and to substitute wherever possible a quantitative measure. The greater importance of social life in America and the stronger gregarious instinct lead to a greater desire to shine by slick self-confidence and easy conversation than by thoughtful and hedged opinions.

The teaching profession in America is not well paid. A recent case well publicized in America concerned a teacher who left to become a van-driver, thereby nearly doubling his pay. Teachers' salaries vary considerably from state to state, and are generally lowest in the South. There is, of course, a general anti-intellectualism in America of which teachers and professors are some of the victims, despite the general public's desire for better educational facilities. Many factory workers are far better paid than the average school-teacher, and so quite often is the school caretaker. Teachers and professors are examined often in great detail before appointment. Once again, a simple mathematical approach is often used. In one such method there is a list of sixty-seven different aspects alongside of which are seven different groups, each comprising three items—positive, negative, and zero. The 'aspects' include such horrors as: stable integrated character, non-neuroticism, gregariousness, articulateness, socio-economic status, teacher leadership, well-readness, buoyancy, and drive. Marks are given at the seven stages in a person's career—plus, minus, or negative. The results are then totted up and the answers provide the right teacher for the job. It is simply amazing that teachers should be evaluated in such a manner, but this approach is typically American.

Teachers are also expected to produce research work or a thesis in vacations. Wide reading, travel, and deep thought are less respected than bulky manuscripts, preferably with statistical appendices. As promotion depends in some measure at least on such activities, the tendency is to superficial thinking and sheer verbosity. Professors are similarly affected, and so indeed are candidates at all educational levels.

Recent years have seen a growing tendency for standards of scholarship to decline still further, mainly as a result of the demand by parents that pedagogical standards be not allowed to prevent children from 'graduating'. Complaints from employers suggest that many scholars are leaving school unable

to spell or calculate correctly and with little sense of social decorum or restraint. The teaching of Americanism in schools has meant from the eighteenth century onwards that teachers must be obviously loyal to the flag. This has led to loyalty oaths, a subject which is constantly cropping up in educational circles in America.

Thus education in America is continuing to develop along lines well established by the facts of the country's history and existence. These lines are diverging from rather than converging on the educational methods and principles of Britain.

JOHN BROWN

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA

WHATEVER LITERARY work Arnold of Brescia may have achieved in the course of his stormy career, nothing from his pen has been transmitted to us from the twelfth century. We are dependent solely on the evidence of his contemporaries for whatever knowledge we possess of his life and singular personality. The most trustworthy account of him is given by John of Salisbury in his *Historia Pontificalis*. John was employed at the Roman Curia in 1145-6 when Arnold returned to Italy from exile to make his submission to Pope Eugenius III at Viterbo.

Writing with the detachment of an intelligent eye-witness, John gives us a pen-picture of Arnold who, he says, 'had the priestly dignity; wore the dress of a regular canon, and mortified the flesh with fasting and sackcloth. He was an eloquent preacher, unwearied in the study of scripture, and he inveighed vehemently against the delights of the world. He taught things most consonant with the law of Christians, but as remote as possible from real life.' This is an example of John's dispassionate attitude towards Arnold, to whom he would be just, but with whose views he, as a firm supporter of the authority of the Church, could not agree. It is his sincerity and profound knowledge of men gained in the service of his 'lords and friends of the Roman Church' that makes him so reliable a source for Arnold, whose daring application of the Christian gospel to the life of his time aroused the passionate opposition of other contemporary writers.

Arnold was born to conflict. In the early years of the twelfth century the citizens of his native Brescia were torn between their obedience to the Pope and allegiance to the Emperor. The great communal movement was spreading through Lombardy, and the Patarini were supporting the laity in their grievances

against the wealth and abuses of the clergy and the temporal power of the Pope.

The young Arnold was no doubt influenced by all these disturbing trends in the civic life of Brescia, and particularly by the teaching of the Patarini who were fired with enthusiasm for primitive Christianity. He was educated at the Episcopal school at Brescia, and, having a thirst for knowledge, was early drawn to Paris—then the magnet for all scholars. There, we hear, he became a pupil of Peter Abelard, who, at the height of his power, profoundly influenced the young man by his intellectual freedom and stimulating personality.

We lose sight of him in Paris, where he may have remained for several years; but in 1120 he reappears in Brescia, where he became a priest and later a canon of the Augustine house of the city. Then the picture of him becomes blurred owing to the confused situation in which he was involved. Disturbances arose in Brescia from political and religious tensions between the laity and clergy; and the Bishop, unable to handle them, appealed to Pope Innocent II. John of Salisbury says that Arnold took no part in this conflict before the Bishop went to Rome for help, but that he preached to the people urging a return to the Apostolic piety of the early Church and to the civic virtues of antiquity. But the Bishop must have represented Arnold as the inspirer of the trouble, for the Pope forthwith sentenced him to silence and banishment.

Ejected from Brescia, Arnold seems to have wandered in Lombardy until, hearing of Abelard's forthcoming disputation with Bernard of Clairvaux, he hastened to France in support of his old master, who, a few years earlier, had been called to account for his theological 'novelties' and had had one of his books destroyed. But what had promised to be a spectacular debate between two famous masters became, in effect, a trial for heresy at the Council of Sens (1140), where St Bernard confronted Abelard with a list of heretical statements extracted from his works, a proceeding that Abelard believed was a ruse to turn the assembly against him. He therefore declared he would appeal to the Pope, and withdrew from the meeting with his followers, Arnold among them. But St Bernard had already advised the Pope of the situation, linking Arnold's name with Abelard's in a letter exposing the heresies of the latter. As a result, both Abelard and Arnold were sentenced to monastic internment and their teaching was banned.

Abelard died soon after this, but Arnold, although in St Bernard's eyes a marked man, was allowed to open a small school in Paris. We hear little of his life during the year he remained there. It is said that he interspersed his discourses with indictments of the worldliness of the clergy and denounced St Bernard as 'one, jealous of all who, not being of his school, won distinction in letters and theology'. He was not alone in feeling resentment towards the Abbot for his treatment of Abelard: there were bishops and cardinals who had formerly sat at his feet as students and were still influenced by his original ideas and brilliant expositions of them. But St Bernard secured Arnold's banishment from France within a year.

Undoubtedly, the proscribed preacher had sympathizers who befriended him on his way to Zurich in 1141, where we find him next. It is not known with whom the wanderer sheltered there, and we have only Otto of Freisting's evidence of his activities. Otto was the nephew of the Emperor Barbarossa and held imperialist views prejudicial to Arnold. His references to him in the

Gesta Federico barely conceal his contempt for one he obviously considers an unbalanced and shallow character. 'He was not without natural ability', he writes, 'though gifted with a flow of words rather than with a solid judgement . . . he belonged to that type of man whose mind easily turned to devising heresies and schismatic disturbances'; and all he has to say of Arnold's exile in Switzerland is that 'he assumed the office of a doctor, sowing the seeds of his pernicious doctrine there many days'. Yet it is commonly inferred from a letter the Emperor received ten years later, that Arnold left a powerful impression upon influential persons in Suabia, and, indeed, some writers have thought that from the seeds he sowed there grew the Swiss Republic in after years.

What Otto called Arnold's 'pernicious doctrines' consisted in his logical applications of the pure maxims of the gospel to the society of his day. He taught that spiritual ministration was incompatible with material possession; that bishops who retained their regalia and monks who had property could not hope for salvation; and that the goods of this world belonged rightly to the laity, and the clergy should subsist on the 'first fruits', 'tithes' and free-will offerings of their flocks.

This teaching differs little from what other religious reformers of the twelfth century taught, but he also taught the transfer of all material wealth and temporal power from the clergy to the laity, and that was a doctrine unique in the Middle Ages. Small wonder that it brought Arnold into collision with the feudal princes of the Church and with the Pope; for this religio-social reform, had it been seriously attempted throughout Christendom in that age, would have created chaos and a major revolution. But it was impracticable; Arnold's idealism, if logical in theory, was, as John of Salisbury said dryly, 'very remote from real life'.

Yet Arnold's eloquent exposition of his theories, together with his denunciations of the abuses and immorality of the clergy, deeply disturbed St Bernard, who knew—none better—the weakness and corruption that existed within the Church at that time. In a letter to Eugenius he asks: 'Where amongst those who seem to have been given for a light to the Gentiles can you discover one who does not yield less light than smoke? . . . He is a perfect man today who is not singularly wicked!'

But the saint gave no quarter to anyone who opposed the authority of the Church or of whom he suspected of heretical tendencies, so he was soon on Arnold's trail again. He wrote to the Bishop of Constance urging him to 'put away that wicked person', whereat Arnold was either ejected or departed of his own accord. But he found protection with Cardinal Guido, who was on a mission to Moravia and Bohemia. In him Arnold found a friend who sheltered him for several years. Then the Cardinal received a letter of scandalized reproof from St Bernard for harbouring so dangerous an enemy of the Church—'whose conversation is honey, but whose doctrine is poison'. 'Take care, lest he do greater harm under your authority; for, since he has both the art and the will to do injury, if he be given your favour he will, I fear, be harmful beyond measure.' 'Would to God his teaching were as sane as his life is austere!'

The purity of Arnold's life is vouched for by all his contemporaries who wrote of him. One witness says, 'he was a man even too austere and detached

in his life'; but Walter Map quotes a friend's personal impression of Arnold as 'always amiable and admirable in all he did, while allowing himself no indulgence in food'.

Having completed his mission in 1145, Cardinal Guido returned to Italy. It is thought that Arnold probably stayed with him until then, as John of Salisbury says he did not return to Italy until after the death of Innocent II in 1143. Nothing is known of him again until late in 1145, when, John says, he was reconciled with the Church and made his submission to Pope Eugenius III at Viterbo. We do not hear what errors he confessed, nor if he was forbidden to preach, but the Pope required him to do penance at all the holy places in Rome, and John says that Arnold, in agreeing to do this, swore a solemn oath of obedience to the Church. This statement is important, for it clears Arnold of any complicity in the revolution at Rome which occurred not later than 1143, and contradicts Otto of Freising's assertion that Arnold inspired it. That formidable movement was the sequel to a war between the Romans and the Tivolese, in the settlement of which, a year later, the Romans declared that the Pope had favoured the enemy with too generous terms. Hence they revolted. Arnold was not in Italy when the revolt took place, but the capital was still seething with discontent when Pope Eugenius sent him there in 1145-6, committing what, in the circumstances, seems to have been one of his few imprudent acts.

John of Salisbury says that Arnold took no part in the city's politics at first, but while he was performing his acts of grace he won favour with the citizens. It was not until the Pope left Italy for his long visit to France in 1147 that Arnold began to preach freely and to attract a large personal following, including many of the clergy. We do not know when he began to identify himself with the republican cause. He may soon have come to see it as the logical conclusion of his own dual principle of reform, and may even have agreed that the time was ripe for the Romans to stand firm for their civic freedom. Years before, his eloquent preaching had fanned the flame of revolt in the Brescians. Then he had been influenced by the teaching of the Patarini; now he renewed their arguments against the Roman See. John tells us that Arnold took an oath to protect the people against all men, especially the Pope.

When Eugenius, returning from France in 1148, heard of this, he excommunicated and censured Arnold and forbade the clergy to have any relations with him. Later he called on the Romans to expel him from the city. Arnold's prestige seems to have fallen in consequence of this, but the republicans refused to give him up. John says that this action of the Pope doubtless made Arnold think he was freed from his oath of obedience, as from this time he became increasingly entangled in the political issues.

The Romans wanted the same independence as the northern city communes had procured for themselves, largely through commerce. But Rome, differently situated, could not imitate these cities either in trading with other cities or with the East. Moreover, the Pope was her feudal lord, and she, 'the Eternal City', was by her historic tradition the centre of Christendom. Her citizens consisted of great nobles, lesser lords, and the poor. There was no middle class from which the merchants of the northern communes were drawn. The Emperor also had a traditional claim on her; he had to be crowned there by

the Pope. So, as Gebhart has said: 'If the Pope were robbed of his feudal dignity, and the Emperor deprived of the mystical capital of the Empire, the keystone of the arch that upheld the political system of Christendom would be removed!'

But these larger considerations do not appear to have concerned the Romans, who were a notoriously violent people with insufficient outlet either for their energy or ability. Hence they were constantly at war with their neighbours and between themselves. 'These are they,' wrote St Bernard to Eugenius, 'who cannot endure to be subject, yet they know not how to rule . . . unfaithful to their superiors, insufferable to their inferiors.' Certainly the manner in which they conducted their public affairs suggests they were intemperate, undisciplined men, unfitted for self-government.

The republic they established after the revolution aimed a mortal blow at the Pope's authority in Rome, as it claimed for itself the temporal power and rights of the Pope throughout his dominions. They shut the gates of the city on Eugenius, only to open them again to him when, in an attempt at reconciliation, he consented to recognize their commune. But the Pope could not remain in Rome because of their tyranny.

It is difficult to understand how Arnold, the self-controlled ascetic, could have remained with them so long unless he hoped that he would ultimately convert all Rome to his religious as well as his social reform. We know that among the citizens he had a large following who were later to be known as 'the Sect of the Lombards'. The republicans were doubtless glad to have among them so eloquent a preacher as Arnold, and may even have persuaded him that his exalted ideals were theirs also. But a letter from the Pope to Wibald, the chief adviser to the Emperor Conrad, in 1152, suggests that by this time Arnold had become a party leader, conspiring to secure the return of 100 of his adherents as 'life' Senators at the forthcoming election, to appoint two consuls, and elect an 'Emperor'—a proceeding which enabled the Pope to represent Arnold as a rebel against the Emperor's authority and to press for an alliance with Conrad. This he secured by the Treaty of Constance, by the terms of which the Emperor undertook the recovery and defence of the Pope's temporal power; and in return the Pope agreed to crown Conrad in Rome and uphold his authority.

But Eugenius died in 1153, and John of Salisbury's account of Arnold's career ends at this time. The new pontiff was too old to have any effect on the situation, and the records of the following year are too confused and slight to give any idea of the course of events in Rome. Then Conrad died before he could fulfil his agreement with the Pope, and Frederick Barbarossa was elected Emperor. In the same year Nicholas Breakspear became Pope as Adrian IV. This new pontiff was a practical, vigorous Englishman, distinguished for his energy and learning. He at once determined to show the Romans that he was their spiritual as well as, rightly, their feudal lord. As a first step he called for the expulsion of Arnold and his followers, and when riots followed he pronounced an interdict over the city. This was in Holy Week, and the citizens were appalled at the prospect of no Easter festival. They reacted as no doubt Adrian had hoped they would. Carried away by emotion, the fickle populace abandoned Arnold to his fate, and on Maundy

Thursday the Senators submitted to the Pope. The interdict was lifted and the people celebrated Easter with much rejoicing.

Arnold found refuge with a friendly Count for a time on the borders of Tuscany, but when the Emperor descended from the north determined to be crowned at Rome, he was betrayed into his hands, condemned as a traitor and hanged.

We should have known nothing more of Arnold's tragic end had not a poem, written in the following decade by Berquemasque, been found in the Library of the Vatican in 1881. It gives an account of Arnold's death and may be regarded as the work of an eyewitness. From it we learn that Arnold remained serene and dignified to the end, quietly refusing to abjure his opinions. They seemed to him, he said, in all things good and true, and he was not afraid to die for them. He only asked for an interval in which to confess his sins to Christ. Whereat, we are told, the bystanders and even the executioners were moved to tears.

His execution took place outside Rome in June 1155 and, lest his remains should be revered by his followers, his body was burned and his ashes were thrown into the Tiber.

Viewed after the passage of 800 years, Arnold's failure and death seem to have been inevitable. The forces against him were too powerful for any one man to challenge with impunity and survive. A sort of fatality seems to have driven him into circumstances which, given his uncompromising attitude towards authority, made him immediately suspect.

Other religious reformers had denounced the vices of the age as strongly as he did—and none more so than St Bernard—but they expected or hoped for a movement of reform within the framework of the existing order of Church and State; whereas Arnold believed that the chief source of the evils of his time had their root in the very structure of that order, and his remedy was in the separation of the Church and its ministration from the secular government of the laity.

He looked back for his inspiration to the early Church and to the first Roman republic, seeing in both a vision of perfection which had never really existed. His gaze forever on the light, the darkness for him was non-existent. As Gebhart said of him: 'He had tasted the honey of the ideal, and the reality killed him.'

But there have not been wanting historians who have seen Arnold as a 'great figure' whose ideas contained the germ from which in time would grow a true Christian democracy. Vallari, in the nineteenth century, linked Arnold's name with Dante's and Savonarola's as 'one of the first few to urge humanity towards the goal that even at this time is still unattained, but towards which we are straining with redoubled effort'.

H. G. BUDGE

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS

ON 28th March 1592 there was born in Moravia one of the most justly celebrated men of the seventeenth century. His name was John Amos, but he was better known as Comenius, from Comna or Comensky, the place of his nativity. In 1616, after studying at the Universities of Herborn and Heidelberg, he became headmaster of a school at Prierau. In the same year he was ordained a minister of the Church of the United Brethren, perhaps more generally known in this country as the Moravian Church; and in 1618 he was appointed minister at Fulneck in Moravia. At this place, with which his name will always be associated, he took upon himself the direction of the school. In this dual capacity of educator and Moravian pastor and, later, bishop, he won undying fame. Three years after he had settled at Fulneck, war broke out, and Spanish soldiers appeared on the scene. The village was sacked and burnt, and Comenius had to flee for his life. For a short time he found a place of refuge in the castle of baron Charles von Zerotin, where other Brethren had assembled. There, for those in distress and hiding, he wrote his famous allegory, *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*, which has been called the Bohemian *Pilgrim's Progress*. A new edict, even more severe, was soon issued by the emperor, and Charles von Zerotin was ordered to dismiss all Protestants who had taken refuge with him. With a part of his congregation, Comenius emigrated through Silesia into Poland. As the exiles passed over the Giant Mountains, they halted and fell upon their knees, and Comenius uttered a memorable prayer that God would not quite remove His gospel from Moravia and Bohemia, but would preserve for Himself a 'Hidden Seed'. Then the band of exiles struck up a hymn and resumed their journey.

At Lissa, in Poland, Comenius formed a congregation, and also conducted a grammar school. Whilst there, in 1631, he wrote one of his most famous books, entitled, *The Gate of Languages Unlocked*. This work was translated into twelve European languages, and also into Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. As time passed he published several other notable educational works. In a fire at Lissa, in 1656, he lost nearly all his books, and left there for Frankfort-on-Oder; thence he went to Hamburg, and later to Amsterdam, where he became a private tutor to the children of some merchants.

From his youth upwards, Comenius regarded ignorance as the great enemy of man; he called it the root of all evil, and knowledge the root of all good. Even as a boy he expressed dissatisfaction with the methods of education then in vogue—the cramming of the minds of boys with words and phrases which had no definite meaning. The method he proposed was to teach them about *things*—to give them object-lessons—and thus to appeal to their senses. Some of his books were illustrated with pictures. His *Orbis sensualium pictus* (1658) is said to have been the first children's picture-book ever produced. His method of teaching Latin and Greek consisted in giving, in parallel columns, sentences in the vernacular and in the language to be taught. He insisted that languages should be taught, like the mother-tongue, by topical conversations; pictures and objects should be used. In his course he included singing, politics, world

history, geography, science, arts and handicrafts. One of his dreams was the establishment of a great universal college, which would teach all branches of knowledge.

Comenius was invited by the leading men in France, Holland and Sweden to come and expound his scheme. At last, by invitation of our Parliament, he came to England, and laid his scheme before the House of Commons. The members approved, and he was offered Chelsea College, with all its revenues, so that he might found his great 'College' in England. But the outbreak of the Civil War in 1641 put an end to the enterprise, and Comenius returned to Holland.

The contribution made by Comenius to the life of the Moravian Church was equally outstanding. It should be of special interest to Methodists in view of the part played by Moravian teaching in the evangelical conversion of John Wesley. In 1632 Comenius was consecrated bishop of the dispersed Brethren from Bohemia and Moravia. During the period from 1648 to 1671 he was President of the Synod, i.e. of the governing body of the Moravian Church, and in this capacity he rendered service of the utmost value to the Church of which he was the most distinguished leader. In 1649 he made an extract of a book written by Joannes Lasitius—a Polish nobleman who, in his travels in 1570, had become intimately acquainted with the Brethren in Bohemia—under the title, *History of the Origin and Achievements of the Bohemian Brethren*. To this work Comenius added another book, treating of the manners and institutions of the Brethren. He also published *An Exposition of the Discipline and Constitution of the Church of the United Brethren*, and a *Catechism* which was dedicated to all the dispersed sheep of Jesus Christ, and particularly to those at Fulneck and its neighbourhood.

At one time it seemed to Comenius that it was possible that the Bohemian and Moravian Church might become extinct, because (outside Poland) he was its last bishop. With this possibility in mind, the *Exposition* referred to above was dedicated, as his last will and testament, to the Church of England, for which he had a great affection. The hope was expressed that should the Church of the Brethren, in some form, survive, the English Church would have special regard for it, in view of the witness it had borne to evangelical truth.

Comenius, however, did not entirely lose his faith in the survival of the Church of the United Brethren. He therefore took steps to secure the consecration of a bishop to succeed himself, 'in hope against hope'. Upon the death of Martinus Gertichius, a Polish bishop of the Brethren, in 1657, his colleague, John Buettner, wrote to Comenius, as President of the Synod, suggesting that he should consider the appointment of successors, lest after the decease of them both, the order of bishops should cease. After much consideration, two bishops were chosen—namely, Nicolaus Gertichius for the congregations in Poland, and Petrus Figulus, surnamed Jablonsky (from Jablonne, his native place), for the Brethren in Bohemia and Moravia and those who were dispersed elsewhere. They were duly consecrated in 1662. Since Comenius, on account of his advanced age, could not appear in person, he sent his co-elder, Daniel Vetter, to the Synod, held at Mielenczyn, giving him full power, and a consecration in writing, according to the custom of the primitive Church, when, in times of trouble and persecution, two or more bishops

could not meet to consecrate another bishop. Peter Jablonsky, who married the daughter of Comenius, was intended to be his successor, but unfortunately he died before him, in 1670. His son, Daniel Ernest Jablonsky, was chosen as his successor in the same year, and appointed to preside both over the Brethren in Poland and those of the dispersion.

Daniel Ernest Jablonsky became a link between the Ancient Church and the Renewed Church of the Brethren. In 1722 a group of refugees from Moravia, under the leadership of Christian David, were allowed by Count Zinzendorf to establish a colony at Herrnhut, in Upper Lusatia in Saxony. This was the parent of various other colonies of a similar kind. These colonies flourished, and sent out missionaries to various parts of the world. Such was their success that they felt moved to restore their ancient form of episcopal government, which had originally been received through the Waldensian bishops in Austria (1467). In 1735 Jablonsky duly consecrated David Nitschmann as the first bishop of the Renewed Church of the Brethren, with particular reference to the oversight of the missions of the Brethren. It was this same David Nitschmann who led a party of about thirty missionaries to Georgia in October 1735, and who travelled by the same ship as John and Charles Wesley and their friends. August Gottlieb Spangenberg had already escorted thither a group of missionaries, and was awaiting the arrival of the bishop, who had been entrusted with the organization of the Church in that place.

It is well known how, during his stay in Georgia, John Wesley was closely associated with the Moravians in Georgia, and how on his return to England, the influence and teaching of Peter Bohler, another Moravian, did much to prepare the way for his evangelical conversion at the meeting in Aldersgate Street. John Amos Comenius, born three hundred and sixty-three years ago, who did so much to secure the reconstitution of the Ancient Moravian Church, may thus be said to be one of the spiritual ancestors of John Wesley.

EDWARD LANGTON

Recent Literature

EDITED BY C. RYDER SMITH

New Testament Theology, by Ethelbert Stauffer. Translated by John Marsh. (S.C.M. Press, 25s.)

This book will probably take its place as the best introduction to New Testament theology available. It contains the fruits of a lifetime of study, presented in sixty-six short concentrated chapters of crystal clarity. Moreover, the breadth of the author's interests lends an engaging freshness to many of the subjects with which he deals. One might complain that the short bibliography at the head of each chapter contains an undue preponderance of books written over twenty-five years ago, and, more seriously, that there is no index of subjects, though in mitigation one must bear in mind the relatively low price. On the other hand, one must commend the writer for presenting a straightforward text and relegating his references to the works of other scholars to the 838 notes at the end. Stauffer's point of view might be described as realistically Biblical. The old Biblical tradition, by which is meant the Old Testament mediated *via* the apocryphal literature and forming the living thought-world of New Testament times, illuminates the New Testament throughout, whereas such quotations as there are from Hellenistic literature 'serve only as adornments of style, not as foundation stones of thought'. The major section of the book is headed 'The Christocentric Theology of History in the New Testament'. Stauffer looks first at the preparation for the Incarnation and then proceeds to examine the teaching of Jesus. There is no suggestion of pitting the simple Jesus against the subtle and melancholy Paul. The New Testament story is one throughout. Great stress is laid on the use Jesus made of the title 'Son of Man'. This is 'the fundamental Christological term of the New Testament' and, far from implying that by using it Jesus was desirous of saying He was, 'and wanted to be, no more than a man among men', it is 'just about the most pretentious piece of self-description that any man in the ancient East could possibly have used'. The meaning of the title is derived from Daniel 7 and the subsequent apocalyptic tradition. St Paul has the same ideas under such terms as 'the second man', 'the man from heaven' and 'the last Adam'. An examination of the other titles of Jesus and the references to His work points in the same direction. The New Testament requires a high Christology and at the same time a high doctrine of those who come to God through Christ. The Church is 'the covenant community of the Messiah'. Admission to the Church is through baptism and the baptized person is 'saved', though baptism does not save indubitably. Infant baptism was practised by the earliest Christians. 'What was there to hinder them? Nothing. What was there to urge them to it? Everything.' A most interesting examination of the doctrine of final destiny leads to the conclusion that the impenitent suffer in an interim state, but that finally the mighty love of God will triumph in every soul. The argument here and on one or two other points will not convince every reader.

PERCY SCOTT

The Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II., by Rudolf Bultmann. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. (S.C.M. Press, 25s.)

Those who turn to the second volume of Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament* to gain more light on the process of the 'de-mythologizing' of the Christian faith will be either disappointed or relieved. The first part of the new volume, some ninety pages, deals with the Gospel of St John and the three Johannine Epistles; the remainder ('the development towards the ancient Church') traces 'the rise of Church Order and

its earliest development', 'the development of doctrine', 'the core of the development' (Christology and Soteriology), and 'the problem of Christian living'. The author treats the Johannine writings (excluding the Apocalypse) as one *corpus*. He begins by pointing out St John's differences from the Synoptics; then what he has in common with them; followed by the author's exposition of the Johannine position under the headings of Johannine dualism, the 'krisis' of the world, and faith. Bultmann does not discuss any of the well-known problems of Johannine controversy; he lays it down that 'the figure of Jesus in John is portrayed in forms offered by the Gnostic-Redeemer myth', by which Paul had been already influenced, but of a Judaic rather than Hellenistic colour. The Revealer and the world cannot understand one another; hence the 'krisis' or separation. The coming of Jesus is the eschatological event; it marks the end, existential rather than temporal. While the Revealer is what he says, the Word, when we ask what it is that he reveals, we are given, Bultmann says, no content for the revelation. But he is what the world has been looking for from the beginning. True, John 'de-mythologizes' his eschatology; 'many Antichrists have come already'; and though the Evangelist used 'mythological' expressions, such as that the Father loves the Son, yet the myth is left behind by the revelation—the revelation which is its own justification and its own content. The Redeemer is a cosmic figure; and the cosmic and the eschatological are one. Whether we use Bultmann's awkward word or not, it is plain that for him the task and the triumph of revelation is to free itself from the 'here and now', the 'there and then', the '*Dasein*', in fact; and that whatever the coming of Jesus in the flesh may mean, it does not mean that at a given time in history the Revealer spoke and acted and died and rose again. The new Gnosticism must make its peace as well as it can with the old. The remainder of the book considers the rise of a settled ministry, of doctrine and conduct, on the basis of the New Testament canon and the Apostolic Fathers—Barnabas, Hermas, 1 Clement and the Ignatian Epistles receiving special attention. The general conclusion is the not unfamiliar one that the sub-apostolic age fell rapidly away from the more spiritual and daring conceptions of Paul and John; that Clement, for example, was unacquainted with Paul, either at Corinth or Rome. Bultmann indeed gives the most careful and detailed references; but whatever we may think of the 'myth', the life has gone out of his work. 'Ye have taken away my Lord'; and one is left wondering how such a Church, with such a Redeemer, could have survived Nero and Domitian and the tenth persecution. The Church is indeed a 'bourgeois', and in one of the senses of the word, an 'eschatological society'! Yet it may be that Wisdom, surveying a wider horizon than the author allows, will be (to use a favourite word of the translator) 'right wised of all her children'.

W. L. LOFTHOUSE

The Gospel According to St John, by C. K. Barrett. (S.P.C.K., 63s.)

The fact that Professor Barrett acknowledges so warmly the benefit that he has received from Dr Bultmann's very important commentary on the Fourth Gospel will give the reader an idea of the nature of his own work. To him the theological interest of the Gospel is supreme, and the question of its literal historicity secondary. Consequently this commentary is likely to exercise more influence as an essay in theological exegesis than as providing an answer to the question, 'But did Jesus say and do the things that are written in this book?' 'We beheld His glory' and 'We know that his testimony is true', phrases found at the beginning and end of the Gospel, are both interpreted as implying the confirmation of the writer's doctrinal reliability by the Apostolic Church which 'sets its seal upon the veracity of its spokesman'. The Church itself is 'the heir of the apostles and of their authority'. But, of course, this is just the question: how far can the Church, or any part of it at the beginning of the second century, be accepted as having a right to reconstruct past history? Does the gift of the

Spirit to the Church really involve the rewriting of history in the interests of orthodox Christian doctrine? As eyewitnesses, the actual disciples of Jesus, whether called 'apostles' by the second-century Church or not, did possess an authority which none except one of them or one in immediate contact with them could, in the nature of the case, claim. We must summarize the very interesting suggestion made by Professor Barrett himself on pp.113f, though it is only fair to add that he confesses that his hypothesis is 'incapable of proof'—John the Apostle migrated to Ephesus; he wrote apocalyptic works, and predictions like Mark 9 gave rise to the belief that he would survive till the Parousia. When he died, one of his pupils incorporated his written works in the canonical Apocalypse (c. A.D. 96). Another pupil was responsible for the Epistles, and a yet bolder thinker, more widely read both in Judaism and Hellenism, produced John 1-20. This was first seized upon by Gnostics, who at least could recognize its language; only later was it realized by the orthodox Church that its author had beaten the Gnostics with their own weapons. So the Gospel was edited and combined with John 21, which contains material which the Evangelist had left behind him but had not incorporated in his own work. The Evangelist, 'perhaps the greatest theologian in all the history of the Church', was now forgotten, but he had put in his Gospel references to 'the beloved disciple', his own teacher; it was rightly understood that they referred to John the son of Zebedee, but wrongly thought that they meant that the Apostle was the author of the Gospel, so 21₂₄ was modelled on the pattern of 19₃₅. While appreciating the ingenuity of this solution, offered with admirable humility, one wonders whether it is all necessary. Professor Barrett dates the Gospel provisionally about A.D. 100, and then asks if it is probable that either John the Apostle or John the Presbyter could have lived so long. But is the date A.D. 100, really sacrosanct? Supposing we say A.D. 90—a date which gives a little more time for the Egerton and Rylands papyri (dated by the experts A.D. 150) to be copied and circulated and associated with other material. Half a century seems little enough for this, and the beloved disciple, whoever he was, could easily have survived till then. I can remember in vivid detail a whole series of events which happened to me sixty years ago, and I am certain that, if I had been happy enough to have had any association with someone like our Lord, everything that He said and did would be engraved on my memory. Why should one sacrifice the historical background of the Gospel for the sake of ten years? Even if our information comes from Papias—whose date is somewhat uncertain—his chain of authorities, the apostles, the elders, a 'certain follower of them' (the elders) and Papias, do not necessarily, as Dr Barrett allows, involve three generations. 'The real difficulty', he says, 'is the statement that "John the Presbyter" was a disciple of the Lord'. 'Is it conceivable that a personal disciple of our Lord', asks Dr Barrett, 'lived to so great an age?' Why not, if the date is 90-100, and not the time of Papias? The 'certain follower' is surely all the link that is needed. It seems needless to argue that the phrase 'a disciple of the Lord' is a textual corruption, as Dr Barrett suggests, in order to undermine the one link with real historical authority that is left to us! Papias does not necessarily describe the Presbyter as surviving to the middle of the second century, for the time of the words 'are saying' must surely be defined by 'This the presbyter used to say', which follows. The fact, however, that the present reviewer feels that some protest should be made against the modern tendency on the part of progressive Protestant theologians to assume that the Fourth Evangelist has no historically accurate information to give us apart from what he had gleaned from earlier evangelists detracts in no way from his admiration of the learning, the theological acumen, and the lucidity of Dr Barrett's exegesis. In regard to the Last Supper, he argues that it was the Passover, following Dalman and Jeremias, and brings evidence to show that, according to Jewish law, carrying arms was not forbidden at feast-time, but was it not forbidden by Roman Law?

J. A. FINDLAY

An Approach to the Old Testament, by Horace Cleaver. (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

This book has been written primarily to guide the Methodist Local Preacher on Trial in his understanding of the Old Testament. An introductory chapter discusses why the reading of the Old Testament is important for the Christian Church, and provides a bird's-eye view of the history of Israel. The remainder of the book consists of notes on all the most important passages of the Old Testament, explaining the background and the meaning of the text. To achieve this within the limits of 200 pages is no small feat, particularly when the exposition is so clear and accurate. Within such limits extended discussion of difficult passages is not to be expected, and in such cases the author has contented himself with setting down his own view and adding the caution that not all will agree with him. One or two points may call for comment. It is important to remember that the Old Testament as well as the New reveals the grace of God, and that Israel's obedience is expected because God has shown Himself so gracious towards her. This might have been more clearly brought out on pp.9f. and in the note on the Ten Commandments (p.44). On p.58 Samuel is said to be the first of the prophets, whilst on p.34 that honour has been bestowed (rightly) on Moses. But these are small points. Dr W. A. L. Elmslie once said that the uninstructed reader was likely to find the Old Testament an impenetrable jungle. The reader will find Mr Cleaver an excellent guide.

K. S. ARMITSTEAD

The International Lesson Annual, 1956, edited by C. M. Layman. (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$2.95.)

The Adult Sunday School, now almost unknown in this country, though it survives in Wales and in parts of Lancashire, is wide-spread and vigorous in the United States, where it is a very usual custom, after Sunday morning worship, to find men and women gathering together for study and discussion, while their children meet in their separate age-groups. The syllabus usually followed is drawn up annually by an inter-denominational group and is almost entirely biblical. Thus, from January to March in 1956, men and women all over the States will study St Luke's Gospel, this being followed by a three-months' study of the Acts of the Apostles, while the second half of the year is divided between 'Writings of Faith and Encouragement' (New Testament Epistles) and 'Great Passages of the Bible'. This volume is designed for use by Bible Class leaders, and is built on far more comprehensive lines than anything available in this country. For each week's lesson there is offered: (a) The Authorized and Revised Standard versions of the passage to be studied, printed in full in parallel columns; (b) a commentary, with notes about authorship, date and general background; (c) a further commentary, by another writer, devotional in intention, relating the passage to be studied to the needs of our life today; and (d) teaching suggestions, with hints about the presentation of the lesson, suggested questions for discussion, and occasional guidance about activities and projects to which the study of the passage may lead. There are also suggestions about audio-visual aids. As one who has something to do with the production of Sunday School Lesson Notes, one is almost tempted to envy publishers who are able to produce a volume of these dimensions. How many teachers have we, I wonder, who would make use of material on this scale, and how many adult Bible Classes have we where it could be used?

BRYAN H. REED

Moral Judgement, by D. Daiches Raphael. (Allen & Unwin, 16s.)

Those who are dissatisfied with the fashionable reduction of philosophizing to the analysis of 'the ways words behave' in actual usage will welcome this book by the Senior Lecturer in Moral Philosophy at Glasgow University. In acuteness, clearness,

level-headedness, honesty, and modesty, it is the most stimulating book on ethics I have read for a long time. It begins with the question, 'By what ultimate principle or principles can our reflective moral judgements be systematized?' Since many such judgements are evidently not unrelated to one another, they point to some general criterion or criteria. The various criteria that have been put forward, their specific content being omitted, fall into two formal types, the one expressed in terms of duty (or rightness, or obligation), the other in terms of good. Doubtless both terms are required, but the philosophical itch for unity prompts us to inquire whether only one of them is basic. The problem is not a trivial one. If we regard 'good' as the basic notion, we seem to make morality rest at bottom on desire or attraction, and 'ought' then comes in only as prescribing the casual means of the good, or, in Kant's language, as a merely hypothetical imperative. When 'duty' is taken as basic, we think of morality as resting on absolute obligation, without any *necessary* reference to consequences. Dr Raphael puts the notion of duty first: in the current jargon, he declares himself a deontologist, not a utilitarian. He admits 'fittingness', however, as a further concept, to designate the quality of what are for the ordinary moral consciousness works of supererogation. The next main question is consequential: Can all our duties be comprehended in a single principle? Dr Raphael's reasonings lead him to submit that they can, the principle being that every human being should be treated as an end in himself (Kant). He effectively points out that so far as this is a principle, even if not *the* principle, of morality, it excludes any theory that reduces everything to social utility, since such a theory sanctions the sacrifice of individual weal to the interests of the group—that is, overrides justice in the broad moral sense of this term. The Kantian principle is ultimate because it covers more of our reflective moral judgements than any other known principle does. Is it *valid* in any further sense? Is it, for instance, an axiom, or only a postulate? Dr Raphael frankly hesitates to give a firm reply in view of the present tendency to deny that there are any axioms at all other than evident tautologies. Or can it be validated by reference to a particular theory of reality, religious or otherwise? While the book naturally raises the question, it stops short of metaphysics. This is a very bald summary, giving the chief problems and conclusions without the rich field of intervening argument, with its illuminating discussions of such matters as intuition, justice, equality, conflicts of duties, and the freedom of the will. The discussion is throughout perfectly urbane.

T. E. JESSOP

Foundations of Christian Knowledge, by Georgia Harkness. (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$2.75.)

It is becoming increasingly important for British Methodists, and for ecumenical Christians in general, to know something of the trends of thought among the intellectual leaders of American Methodism, but this book is on the whole disappointing, though interesting and valuable in various incidental ways. We expect a Christian epistemology, for the book sets out 'to explore the grounds on which we can know what we know in the field of Christian truth'. What we in fact have is a statement, useful and cogent, of the differing natures of theology and philosophy; an account of various attempted reconciliations between science and theology; and a summary of the various views that are held about the authority of the Bible, the Spirit and the Church. In the course of the discussion there does appear a careful, though not highly philosophical statement of the *requirements* of a valid epistemology, but is this enough? The book is most interesting as expressing the viewpoint of an American Methodist theologian who does not find it necessary to take into account the theological work of the British section of her Church, and who is, as far as one can tell, a liberal who has tried hard, but not always successfully, to understand and assimilate neo-orthodoxy and Biblical theology. Perhaps these facts explain why Professor Harkness includes Methodism

among examples of the 'gathered Church' and holds it to be virtually without a Creed—although 'the Apostles' Creed is widely used in Methodist services, but so are two other creeds expressing our common faith in terms more congenial to contemporary understanding'.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

Philosophy and Religion, by George Whitfield. (Religious Education Press, 6s. 6d.)

Mr Whitfield's book, one of the new 'Gateway' series, seeks to provide material for use by sixth forms in their study of religious knowledge. The author, who is Headmaster of Hampton Grammar School, is to be congratulated on his presentation of the perennial problems of human thought and culture in a form which will arouse the interest and stimulate the further study of those for whom the book is intended. The approach is to deal with various subjects which interest sixth formers and should be part of their general curriculum before their more specialized studies begin. Not only what is narrowly regarded as 'philosophy', but science, ethics, literature and history, are used as convenient starting points for a shrewd and often refreshing exposition of the Christian Faith. Mr Whitfield wisely does not attempt to answer all the questions he raises; the chief value of the book is in opening new realms of thought, and in linking them to a positive Christian outlook. Unlike many brief summaries and introductions to great themes, this work is fascinating to read, and full of suggestions regarding the development of the widest interests in problems of thought and behaviour. In the necessarily brief statement of the content of the Faith, Mr Whitfield exhibits a firm grasp of the truth of the gospel, and is conversant with the findings of modern Biblical theology. Yet there are a few places at which his summary of Christian doctrine is somewhat misleading. It is hardly adequate to describe the Holy Spirit as 'He who brings that strength to our desire to do God's will which rescues our good intentions from ineffectiveness'. And it is more than theological purism which questions the statement that 'the Messiah is God Himself'. But these are small blemishes in what is a very useful introduction to a wide range of subjects. Those who have long since left the sixth form might do worse than read this book if they wish to brush up their philosophy and general knowledge, and preachers will find much help in the author's example of how to approach those whose studies at school leave no place for religion.

WILLIAM STRAWSON

The Religious Orders in England, Volume II: The End of the Middle Ages, by David Knowles (C.U.P., 45s.)

David Knowles' new volume exhibits the same characteristics as all his other writings—wide and exact scholarship, cool judgement, a flowing style and a gentle wit. The two volumes, like his earlier book on *The Monastic Order in England*, are likely to be a standard work for some time to come. The present volume, which covers monastic history in England from A.D. 943 to the Reformation, inevitably invites comparison with the work of Dr G. C. Coulton, though that has a European reference. Coulton for all his learning was frankly a partisan and he did not mind who knew it. Moreover, he did not pay sufficient regard to the date and place of his multitudinous pieces of evidence. Dr Knowles falls into neither of these mistakes. He is a Roman Catholic, but he is through and through a scholar and no partisan, and he is extremely careful to relate his facts to the circumstances of the times. Hence there is a sense of reliability about his work which is both refreshing and heartening. The period from 1336 to 1485 is treated under two headings, the Historical Framework and the Institutional Background. Under the first we have a series of topics such as the position of monks and canons at the universities, the controversy that arose about the ownership of private property, the spiritual life of the times (with an account of the English mystics,

Richard Rolle and others), the development within the Orders themselves and the contemporary criticism of the 'religious'. He gives a high place to Dr H. B. Workman's great book on Wyclif. At this point he makes a notable comparison between Wyclif and Langland who was 'possessed of what Wyclif entirely lacked, a deep fund of love and compassion'. He has also an interesting comparison between Chaucer and Dickens. He gives us a series of admirable portraits of distinguished monks such as the great Thomas de la Mare of St Albans, and there is an excellent account of the building of Ely Cathedral. In his second part he deals with the monasteries as social institutions—their wage system, the recruitment to their numbers, their varied occupations, the cure of souls and the public obligations of heads of houses. The two longest chapters provide a wealth of out-of-the-way information about monastic libraries and about the monastic economy, particularly in the exploitation of the land. The whole book is a quite fascinating study and a joy to read.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things, by Heinrich Quistorp. (Lutterworth Press, 20s.)

This book is yet another very competent contribution to the revival of Reformation scholarship. The original work, entitled *Die Letzten Dinge im Zeugnis Calvins*, has been lucidly translated by Dr Harold Knight. It is a well-documented exposition which draws of course on far more than the *Institutes*; there are also several interesting references to Luther. The theme, eschatology, is one of great current interest. It has been said that this topic once formed the conclusion of volumes of dogmatics but is now the setting of the whole and thus constitutes their prolegomena. But the case of Calvin shows that this is no new phenomenon; his work is throughout eschatological, for it is grounded in hope. The first part of Dr Quistorp's exposition deals with this theme; we found it the less interesting part, possibly because 'hope' has been so exhaustively discussed in the Evanston literature. Then come the traditional 'Last Things'. Calvin asserted that all souls are immortal, and described the interval between the death of the individual and the general resurrection in terms quite other than 'sleep' to which he pays lip-service; of course he did not employ the concept of Purgatory. But this interval is but a prelude to the general resurrection and the last judgement, which form a climax in his thought. He is shown to have wavered a little between 'spiritualizing' tendencies and 'Biblical realism'. This most interesting section throws incidental light on his christology and thought in general. The Calvin who emerges from this, as indeed from any serious study of his writings, differs greatly from Calvin as commonly conceived; the latter is little more than a caricature. Some, for instance, will be surprised to hear that for Calvin the fires of Hell are metaphorical. The questions which Calvin asks about the Last Things are those which are still asked by serious thinkers, though the popular attitude to death is perhaps somewhat prone sentimentally to ignore them and the uncertainty of some of our more recent Protestant teaching on them has driven some to Romanism or spiritualism. But are Calvin's answers still valid? Professor Torrance, in a foreword of characteristic enthusiasm, praises Calvin, 'the father of modern theology', as being above all a 'Biblical Theologian'. Dr Quistorp is rather more cautious. Unlike many exegetes of the Reformers, he is willing to criticize, and in particular points out the unbiblical nature of Calvin's conception of the soul. But he does not refer to the silent revolution which has taken place since Calvin's day on many of these topics and which cannot be dismissed as just so much error. William Temple said 'There is a very strong case for thinking out the whole subject again in as complete independence as possible, alike of medieval and of Protestant traditions.' Dr Quistorp would certainly not go so far as that. But whether we think Calvin right or wrong we ought to know what he said; and this is here expounded to us in a clear and interesting way.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

Banned Books, by A. L. Haight. (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)

Censorship is a difficult and controversial subject, and there is no attempt in this book to argue the case one way or the other, though the publishers say that it makes a major contribution to the cause of freedom for books. Trends in censorship are outlined, a number of statements by eminent people about the freedom of the Press are reprinted, and a record is presented of some important American court decisions. But the main and most interesting part of the book is a chronological list of books banned from 387 B.C. to A.D. 1954, with the reasons for their prohibition. It is a quite astonishing record. We are prepared to be reminded that Tyndale's New Testament was the first printed book to be banned in England, but we hardly expect to hear that in America part of a copy of the Revised Standard Version was solemnly burned by a Baptist minister in 1953. We can see why there should be legislation about horror comics, but we cannot help raising an eyebrow at the news that Nicholas I of Russia banned Hans Andersen's *Wonder Stories* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, that the U.S.S.R. banned *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*, that Yugoslavia banned the Mickey Mouse comic strip, and that Italy banned Popeye the Sailor. We know the ways of Rome and remember about Galileo, but are nevertheless surprised that the Spanish *Index* prohibits *Robinson Crusoe*. We recognize that a classic sometimes offends popular taste when it is first published, but we find it regrettable that Malory's *Morte D'Arthur* was thought not more than 'bold adultery and wilful murder', that *Gulliver's Travels* was judged to be 'wicked and obscene', and that *Adam Bede* was withdrawn from all the circulating libraries. One of the most extraordinary pieces of censorship, however, was the prohibition by the Lord Chamberlain in 1905 of the performance of *The Mikado*. Anyone who wishes to argue about the ways of censors should certainly acquaint himself with the information that Mrs Haight provides. J. ALAN KAY

The Liberating Secret, by Norman P. Grubb. (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

Mastery: The Art of Mastering Life, by E. Stanley Jones. (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$1.75.)

Our Freedom, by Minnie Sagers. (Arthur H. Stockwell, 10s. 6d.)

The first two of these books are concerned, each in its individual way, with Christian perfection. Mr Grubb, the son-in-law and biographer of C. T. Studd, is what would be called a left-wing evangelical. He keeps closely to the Bible, whose parts he interprets as of level authority. He conceives the Christian life as marked by three grades or stages denominated (with the evangelical's characteristic fondness for alliteration) as Salvation, Sanctification, Saviourhood. The 'Liberating Secret' is union (or 'identification') with Christ—'true regeneration is no formal objective faith by itself, but is only true if it is accompanied by an inner revelation of union with the Son within'. There is a good deal of the mystic in Mr Grubb, and this, together with his vitality of conviction, gives the book an arresting quality. Indeed, there is much in it of value even if occasionally there are passages and expressions which suspend assent—such as of the blood of Christ 'automatically cleansing unrecognized sin', or the insistence on the Old Testament view that the intercession of Moses 'changed God's mind', though Mr Grubb adds somewhat paradoxically: 'Of course it did, because it always was His mind to save them.' He has an interesting chapter on 'The Law of Opposites', and gives a challenging presentation of the meaning of priesthood and intercession. At the end of the book he states dogmatically the fundamentalist attitude on Christian unity.

In Dr Stanley Jones's book, there are daily readings on connected themes for a calendar year, each concluding with a brief prayer and an 'Affirmation for the Day'.

The Acts of the Apostles provides the ground of the book. It tells how 'A group of ordinary people were mastered by the risen Christ moving into them in the Holy Spirit, and thus mastered, they moved out to master their circumstances and their relationships into a miniature Kingdom of God'. Dr Jones's mind is not so much mystical as analytical and practical, and his listing of the details of mastery through the Holy Spirit (who is characterized as 'the applied edge of redemption') in the three-page ordering of 'Contents' extends to no less than fifty-four particulars, covering a wide range from social and race distinctions to 'narcotics and pick-me-ups'. The comments are reinforced by the author's well-known arts of telling phrase and real-life illustration.

The third of these books has as its background the recent 'Mission to the Nation' in Australia and its author is an Australian. It is arranged in three parts, the first confronting the nation with the ideals of freedom and the accusation of 'things as they are'; the second presenting the challenge in the light of the Old Testament; the third pressing it from the New Testament standpoint—the Christian Way and the dominion of the Spirit. It is a simple, earnest, and right-minded appeal, a little discursive and repetitive, with no great distinction of style. For a book of this character and prospective constituency the price is rather deterring.

PHIL. J. FISHER

Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel, Edited and translated by Theodore G. Tappert. (S.C.M., 30s.)

Luther's reforming work began as the result of a pastoral concern, and the last act of his life was an act of devoted pastoral service. All his days he was engaged in pastoral activities of one sort or another, and he is but half understood—and indeed misunderstood—if this aspect of his work is left out of account. Whatever else he may have been, he was always a shepherd of souls, whose care for the flock is revealed, not only in his letters, but again and again in his sermons, lectures, commentaries, tracts, pamphlets, and almost everything he said or wrote. The range and variety of his work in this direction is, however, admirably illustrated by the selection of letters (together with a few passages from his 'Table Talk' and a sermon or two) that is now published in the Library of Christian Classics. People high and low turned to Luther for help and advice on all manner of subjects, from predestination to polygamy; and he also wrote to many, known and unknown to himself, at the request of others. He sent letters of comfort to the suffering, and of consolation to the bereaved; he sought to encourage the anxious and despondent, and to guide the perplexed; he advised ministers about their work and laymen about the way to treat their ministers, and so on. All that he wrote sprang from his understanding of the Gospel, and can be said to be a preaching and application of the Gospel to particular persons, problems, situations. From one point of view, it is all an attack on the devil (in whatever guise he may appear) with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Or we could say that it is an attempt to take people out of themselves—to deliver them from cramping and crippling self-concern, of whatever kind—by establishing them in trusting and obedient faith towards God. Spiritual counsel is, as Dr Tappert says in his Introduction, part and parcel of Luther's theology. There is therefore a good deal to be learnt about the latter in these letters, as well as about Luther himself and the times in which he lived. But there is also not a little that will be of value both to those who are in need of spiritual counsel, and those whose duty it is to give it. The letters have been well chosen, well translated into clear, modern English—as modern, at any rate, as Luther can tolerate—and furnished with necessary, but not excessive, explanatory comments. There are useful bibliographies and indexes, and a very good introduction. This is a handsome volume, well worthy of its place among the Christian classics.

PHILIP S. WATSON

The Protestant Tradition, by J. S. Whale. (C.U.P., 21s.)

Any book by Dr Whale is assured of a large audience, and not least among Free Church ministers and theological students. As was to be expected, this volume is wise, witty and learned, at times profound and always interesting. It seems a pity that the author has ruined a perfectly good title, for the book is in no sense a review or an appraisal of the Protestant tradition, giving hardly any attention to the great Anglican *corpus*, and giving ten times as much space to the Montanists as to the Methodists. It is rather a series of essays on 'some Protestant traditions'. The work begins with some lucid and informative chapters about Luther, which keep very close to Karl Holl and a little too close to Seeberg, but which make valuable reading for the student of the Reformation. The chapters on Calvin and especially on the varying editions of the Institutes whet the appetite and show us what the author might have given us in a volume on Calvin if he had been so disposed, for here his own appetite and learning and loyalty seem all engaged. The chapters on the Sect Type, heavily saturated with Troeltsch and Bainton, seems to concede too much in the wrong places, and it is hard not to think that David Joris was not much more of a Protestant Falstaff than is here admitted. The fourth part of the work treats modern issues, and is more ephemeral. There is some good hard hitting at modern Roman intolrances, a chapter on Totalitarian States and the Crown Rights of Jesus Christ (the quality drops to 'Beta Plus' about here), and a chapter on the Ecumenical movement and Christology which would make an intensely interesting start to a theological discussion group, but which never works anything out and sometimes relapses into rather dated epigrams ('the cloven hoof of Protestant scholasticism'—vintage 1930?). But this is a book which all will read with profit and pleasure, though it is to be recommended to students with some qualification.

GORDON RUPP

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Royal Priesthood, by T. F. Torrance (Oliver & Boyd, 9s.). In this book Professor Torrance makes a very notable contribution to the problem of Reunion. His scope is very wide. In a hundred and eight pages he discusses pertinently the doctrines of Priesthood and Ministry in both Testaments, of the Church as the Body of Christ, of the relation of the Church to time, of the Resurrection, Ascension and Parousia, and of the Sacraments. His method is argument based on exegesis, with references where need be to Cyprian, Aquinas, Calvin, Barth, and so on. The exegesis involves some of the most difficult of Biblical passages, but Prof. Torrance is not easily daunted. While his own doctrine is of the Presbyterian kind, and while he does not hesitate to expose what he takes to be mistaken doctrines, he concludes that it is possible 'to assimilate into unity the three main aspects of the ministry that appear in churches of the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopal types'. His material is so closely packed that his book is not easy reading, but is no other kind to be undertaken? Would there were indexes!

The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, by J. K. S. Reid (Oliver & Boyd, 5s.). In these three S.C.M. lectures for theological students Dr Reid examines the New Testament evidence for the Doctrine of the Ministry with the patience and skill of an exact scholar. One of his conclusions is that the New Testament lays down no rule for the ordering of the Ministry in later times. He does not rule episcopacy out, but he cannot accept any doctrine of its 'essentiality'. There are frequent references to current discussion. The tone of the lectures is judicial, not partisan, and Dr Reid never hesitates to say '*non liquet*'.

Interim Report of the Special Commission [of the Church of Scotland] *on Baptism* (Church of Scotland Offices, Edinburgh, 2; 2s.). After two years' work the Commission has produced 'an outline study of the Doctrine of Baptism in the New Testament', which the Assembly has sent down to the Presbyteries for discussion. The 'outline' runs to fifty pages of close print. It is a very thorough piece of work, as one would expect. It sets the relatively few texts about Baptism in the large context of the whole teaching of the New Testament and of the relevant parts of the Old. There is a long section in exposition and defence of Infant Baptism. The Commission maintains that 'to speak of Baptism as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace" is not the language of the New Testament'. One phrase used is 'the creative activity of God in Baptism.' In this masterly Report there are things to challenge, but there is no doubt about its timeliness and weight.

The Convocations and South India, by E. L. Mascall (Mowbray & Co., 1s.). In this pamphlet Dr Mascall argues that Anglican 'Catholics', of whom he is one, may accept and even welcome the decisions of the two Convocations on a limited intercommunion with the Church of South India because, though the latter is a 'strangely anomalous body', it 'appears to be moving steadily in the Catholic direction'. Other Anglicans, of course, believe that the Convocations have 'sold the pass'. Dr Mascall writes with restraint and clarity. Among other things, he argues that if an ordaining bishop is in the 'apostolical succession', the 'Catholic' tradition requires that it is not broken even though the bishop and the man ordained both repudiate the doctrine.

The 'Teach Yourself' Books: The Christian Faith, by David H. C. Read (English Universities Press, 6s.). In this book Dr Read explains all the chief doctrines of 'The Christian Faith' under the modern approach—that is, he begins with Jesus Christ, he emphasizes the truth that Christianity is a historical religion, and he develops a

theology of 'encounter'. Under the last he rightly devotes a chapter to the Holy Spirit. He might have said more under the question 'What about the man who says that he knows nothing of any encounter with "God in Christ"?' but he has written a very helpful book. Now and then the Presbyterian peeps out, but why dissimulate? Through this book any intelligent man may 'teach himself'.

Selections from the Journal of John Wesley, edited by Hugh Martin (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.). This is the first volume in a series to be called 'A Treasury of Christian Books'. Dr Martin has made his selection with great skill. I suppose that there is not more than a thirtieth part of the *Journal* here, but the book makes the right impact. We see Wesley's world as well as Wesley. I am glad there are examples of Wesley's humour. The text for the whole, of course, is 'One thing I do'. The number of editorial notes is exiguous. This is my only criticism and a small one. Will every reader know, for instance, that 'the Germans' on the boat to Georgia were Moravians (p. 14), or what Whitefield meant when he said that he and Wesley 'preached two different Gospels' (p. 50)? And ought not a reader to be told that Wesley's famous footnote, 'I am not sure of this' (p. 25), was added many years after he wrote the passage in the *Journal*? Dr Martin ends with extracts from Betsy Ritchie's account of Wesley's last illness and final witness. The new series has begun well.

Walking with God, by W. J. Smart (Hodder & Stoughton, 10s. 6d.). In this book Mr Smart gives us portraits of twelve modern soldiers of Christ. While no two are alike, their stories all fall under the text that begins 'Inasmuch as . . .'. The author has done his work well (though Germany was not ruled by Communists after 1918). He is at his best in the earlier chapters. Here is his list: Kagawa, Studdert Kennedy, Sundar Singh, C. F. Andrews, George Carver, James Aggrey, Edith Brown, Edgar Helms, Otto Dibelius, Joseph Mindszenty, William Temple, Wilfred Grenfell. This enheartening book is full of vivid pen-pictures.

Religious Freedom in Spain, Its Ebb and Flow, by John David Hughey, Jr. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 15s.). After an account of the suppression of religious toleration in Spain by the Inquisition in the sixteenth century, Dr Hughey turns to the nineteenth and twentieth. He shows how large a part anti-clericalism, rather than anti-Romanism, has played in the story, and how often 'liberal' politicians, who were themselves indifferent to religion or even atheists, have advocated religious freedom as one of the fundamental freedoms. The Protestants themselves, always numerically insignificant, have taken almost no part in the political struggle, but their wrongs and their steadfastness under them are illustrated period by period. Papal intolerance in a Catholic country stands out starkly. The writer takes care to be factual and his book is very fully documented, even to accounts of speeches in the Cortes. His title for the chapter on the Franco period is 'Return to Catholic Unity'. Few books deal with their subjects more thoroughly.

Man and His Needs, by John Lawson (Edinburgh House, 5s.). *Green and Pleasant Land*, by John Lawson (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.). In the first of these books Mr Lawson asks, 'What has Christianity to say about the present plight of the world?', and first tells us what God means man to be. Then, giving much of his space to an abundantly illustrated account of the present 'mess', he shows that man has four desperate 'needs'—for Food, for Freedom, for Fellowship, and for Forgiveness (and reconciliation to God)—and that Christianity, rightly understood, meets every one of them. This is an able, ardent and factual book. It might be called 'The Facts and the Gospel'. It concludes with 'Questions for Group Discussion'. The second book is probably unique. In it Mr Lawson turns from the world to the village (and country town). Here he depicts with relentless candour a 'natural community' which is both 'divided by religion' and religiously

comatose. In his typical village there is both an Anglican Church and a Methodist 'chapel', for this is the situation that is commonest and of which he himself has wide experience. He has chapters on 'Country Evangelism', 'Rural Youth Work', and 'The Rural Ministry', and he ends with a plea and plan for a movement towards reunion in villages. He lays bare the *real* grounds of the distinction between 'church' and 'chapel' in a village with great acumen. I hesitate about a phrase here and there, but, to use a country metaphor of Wesley's, this is a book that 'bolts the matter to the bran', and the village is a momentous matter.

Captives to Freedom, by Douglas Thompson (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.). This book gripped me as few do. Padre Thompson, captured with his unit of 'Desert Rats', spent much of the War in P.O.W. camps—first in north Africa, then in Italy, and then in Germany. In these camps he found, or rather made, a whole network of opportunities of Christian service, teaching captives to be 'free indeed'. The book has both pace and colour. As one vivid detail follows another the reader is almost 'there'. In particular, the Padre depicts men—British and South African and Italian and German and so on—with a masterly stroke or two. And, without any hint of self-consciousness, he depicts himself. This is both a fine 'war book' and a tonic for faith.

Challenge to Heritage, by Ruth Anderson Oakley (St Catherine Press, 6s.). Every child, from birth (and before) to maturity, has a right to the 'heritage' of home; today there is dire danger that he will lose it. Mrs Oakley shows how multiform the danger is, but her main subject is 'the practice of motherhood'. Here she gives guidance stage by stage in the child's life. She knows her psychology, but keeps it in its place. She writes throughout, not only with knowledge, but with controlled passion. Her range is wide indeed. She is never sentimental, but always factual. This is the very book for a generation that is doing all things for the child, but fumbles *the* thing.

The Promise Book, by Ida and Leslie Church (Epworth Press, 4s.). Many will have been hoping for another *Homely Year*. Well, here it is, under another plan and arrangement. 'Ida' and 'Leslie' have taken fifty-two promises from *the Book*, which they have found firm in their own sojourning. Each in turn has written a brief meditation on a promise, telling many a story. Then they suggest six longer passages on the same theme, adding a short prayer. They are thinking especially of the 'wayfaring folk' whom they so much love. This is a fragrant book.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

Gospel of Sufferings, by S. Kierkegaard, translated by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Ferrie (James Clarke, 10s. 6d.). Messrs Aldworth and Ferrie have already translated the first two parts of Kierkegaard's *Edifying Discourses in a Different Vein* under the titles *Purify Your Hearts and Consider the Lilies*. They now offer us a translation of the seven discourses in the third part, which, once again, is the first rendering into English. The subject of the first of these discourses describes the theme of them all: 'What is involved in the concept of following Christ; in particular, what joy is involved in it?'

The Gospel of Robinson Crusoe, by F. W. Boreham (Epworth Press, 5s.). In this book Dr Boreham, having pointed out that Defoe himself says that in Crusoe he intended to 'portray his own inner [religious] struggle', describes Crusoe's religion under chapters on 'Crusoe as a Convert', 'as a Philosopher', 'as an Evangelist', 'as a Castaway' and 'as a Mystic'. In each chapter he illuminates the description in his own well-known way. There is no need to say that he tells apt stories.

Wagon on Fire, by William Illsley (Epworth Press, 9s. 6d.). This novel centres in a Boer and Bantu village on the borders of the Orange Free State and Basutoland in the

years after the South African War. The author has a long experience of the area and he 'gets it across'. While the whole story is vivid, that of the hero, Monaona, is especially so. One or two conversations are a trifle 'bookish', but his novel depicts the tangled background of the present South African situation better than many an official report.

Over the Hills and Home Again, by Rita F. Snowden (Epworth Press, 5s.). Some time ago I wrote that, somehow or other, I did not like Rita Snowden's books. Well, I like this one immensely, and I am wondering whether this is because it is a series of 'Talks for Children'! There are thirty-three of them, every one centring in a story.

Will the Church go through the Great Tribulation?, edited by E. W. Rogers (Pickering & Inglis, 5s.). Here Mr Rogers, with three others, discusses the question, 'Will the Church "meet the Lord in the air" before the Great Tribulation?' One of his chief contentions is that there is 'a gap' between the sixty-ninth and seventieth 'weeks' in Daniel.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

The Fate of the Soul, an Interpretation of Some Primitive Concepts, by Raymond Firth (C.U.P., 2s. 6d.). . . . *Seventeenth Century Influences on the Evangelical Revival of the Eighteenth Century*, by J. H. Stringer (London Bible College, 19 Marylebone Road, N.W.1, no price named). . . . *The Quaker Understanding of the Christian Faith*, by Herbert G. Wood (Friends House, 6d.). . . . *Quakerism and Community Care*, by Alfred Torrie (Friends House, 4d.). . . . *Daniel Oliver and Emily, His Wife*, by Lettice Jowitt (Friends House, 1s. 6d.). . . . *Science and the Great Design*, by Arthur Trafford (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.).

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- The Expository Times*, September (T. and T. Clark, 1s. 6d.).
 Archaeological Sites and the Old Testament: Jericho, by Kathleen M. Kenyon.
 Important (New Testament) Hypotheses Reconsidered: An Introductory Article, by Vincent Taylor.
 Paul and James, by Joachim Jeremias.
do., October.
 Contemporary Religious Trends: The Old Testament, by G. Henton Davies.
 Important Hypotheses Reconsidered: The Proto-Luke Hypothesis, by Vincent Taylor.
 Christ and the Old Testament, by J. G. S. S. Thomson.
do., November.
 Paul's Method not a Demonstration but an Exhibition of the Spirit, by C. Clare Oke.
 Modern Methods of Evangelism, by A. Skevington Wood.
 Sanday's Christological Hypothesis, by A. H. Vine.
 A Fourth-century View of the Origins of Christianity (Eusebius), by D. S. Wallace-Hadrill,
The Congregational Quarterly, October (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).
 Editorial (re 'The Protestant Church in Germany').
 E. H. W. Meyerstein, by Nathaniel Micklem.
 Music and Worship, by Peter Taylor Forsyth.
 Charles Wesley and Matthew Henry, by Erik Routley.
The Harvard Theological Review, July (Harvard University Press, via O.U.P., \$1.00).
 Paul and the (Qumran) Manual of Discipline, by Sherman E. Johnson.
 Which was Written First, Luke or Acts?, by Henry G. Russell.
The Hibbert Journal, October (Allen and Unwin, 5s.).
 The Present Relations between Religion and Science—five papers read at the Thinkers' Holiday Summer School, by L. Arnaud Reid, P. E. Hodgson, H. J. Blackham, Dennis A. Routh, and R. J. Zwi Warblowsky.
The International Review for Missions, October (Edinburgh House, 3s. 6d.).
 Nationalism as an International Asset, by M. A. C. Warren.
 Nepal, by E. W. Oliver.
 China Today: Some Reflections against the Background of Yesterday, by D. Gerhardt Rosenkranz.
 Co-operation and Unity, by S. C. Neill.
 The Limits of Co-operation, by Norman Goodall.

